

HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES – NOVEMBER 3, 2024

I. ROLL CALL (18/29 Present)

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

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. Intern for Integrity and Ethics.
 - 1. faq2mc@virginia.edu

III. EXECUTIVE REPORTS

- A. Laura Howard, Chair
 - 1. D&R catch up.
 - 2. P&P catch up.
 - 3. TOTO TL.
 - 4. Recordings for D&R with Jack Wallace and Jonathan Swap.
 - 5. Working with Ali Holtz and Genny Freed on resources for students during their suspension.

6. Met with SSOs about implementation of the new SWG bylaws.
 7. Advisor and I/C pool meetings today (joint).
 8. Next Sunday Lily West at 6:00 PM (optional).
- B. Seamus Oliver, VCI
1. Five cases under active investigation.
 2. Report Intake Form on the website has a new face.
- C. Alex Church, VCH
1. One case in the Hearing selection window. No Hearings currently scheduled. There is one case under Appeal Review.
 2. Working with D&R for recording for the IRB.
- D. Carson Breus, VCS
1. We have a PS for one case on 11/17.
- E. Will Hancock, VCUC
1. ISD is coming together in a few weeks. We have narrowed that to four primary events. Be on the lookout for an advertisement template you all can use.
- F. Ian Novak, VCGC
1. Mine are linked with the subcommittee (see notes in section IV).
- G. Thomas Ackleson, VCO
1. TOTOL candy.
 2. More co-spos.

IV. **SUBCOMMITTEE & WORKING GROUP REPORTS**

- A. Policies and Procedures Committee
1. Mary Holland: We met last Friday we will talk about at Committee in the future.
- B. Faculty Advisory Committee
1. Simran: Our next meeting is scheduled for this coming Wednesday. Thinking about specific departments to reach out to.
- C. Community Relations and Diversity Advisory Committee
1. Ben: We have conducted over 15 coffee chats to evaluate our applicants. We took notes and will finalize our selections soon.
- D. Data and Research Committee
1. Max: We got one of our recordings done as Alex mentioned.
- E. Ad-hoc Subcommittee on Sanctions
1. Will: We'll talk about this more later, but we did not meet this week. We met with the SSOs on implementation of the SWG bylaws and on training new I/Cs and Advisors.
- F. Graduate Student Affairs
1. Ian: Many professors use databases of submitted work. The office of Integrity and Ethics is trying to roll this out to a large audience as a double check for students. More events with Batten soon.

V. **REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS**

- A. Cassidy: We heard back from the Vice Dean of the Law School and they are open to us presenting at Law School orientation, and we sent a proposal to them about that. First Law School SO training is soon, and we have someone interested in Ian's subcommittee.

VI. GUEST SPEAKER

A. HooHacks

1. Ideathon presentation until 7:21 PM.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Revisit last week's discussion about public comment and guest speakers

1. Ian: I liked the idea of them coming with a presentation and public comment is just public comment. I would like to keep today's format.
2. Thomas: I think the five minutes was about the right length.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Discuss representative and Support Office absenteeism and potential solutions

1. Laura: We've had issues reaching quorum in past years, but not this one as much. We are still seeing lower numbers than we'd like at SO events (pool) and representatives. Cassidy and Penelope drafted bylaws.
2. Cassidy: We're concerned about potential unfairness with SOs not being adequately trained if not attending required meetings. For representatives, it's hard to keep up with all of our conversations. That could affect how you proceed in a PS, etc. Our concern is generally with fairness, so our idea is to change the code of ethics. Right now you'd go straight to a Standards Panel, so it might be better to have some sort of "probationary period." If you've missed some number of meetings or similar without making them up, you'd have to go on a probationary period. You'd make a plan to make it up in a reasonable time, and if you didn't *then* you'd go to standards. Some SOs are completely inactive, so formalizing a process is a good idea.
3. Thomas: It is a problem for a few years. We have a census where we ask SOs if they'd like to remain in the pool, and routinely we have people say no. We should definitely continue that.
4. Simran: One thought I had about staffing is implementing some sort of check in to ask why they're not staffing cases.
5. Penelope: Simran that's a great idea. In our write up, what we had in mind with the maximum number of meetings missed, we have a check-in to ask if they need support or a plan.
6. Cassidy: To elaborate, we interviewed three 3Ls who had been SOs and never participated in a case or meeting.
7. Will: One idea, I'm thinking through how we incentivize people to come. Particularly for representatives. I think having full committee in the room is really important. What if we had dinners every now and then or regularly? We could have it before committee and invite our guest speakers, etc. It's a less formal setting. I also just think that's a cool thing from a community perspective for us as a body. It's hard to do that when we try and plan a dedicated event versus before meetings.
8. Alex: I have a couple points on SOs and one on reps. There was some exec a few years ago that told law students they didn't have to show up to pool. As far as people not showing up, I think there was an issue at the beginning of the semester. When I emailed about a mandatory meeting, there was a full room. Setting

expectations can do a lot. For reps, I think we kind of just need some negative incentives.

9. Penelope: This doesn't work unless we have a really healthy expectation setting, and people are busy. It comes to a point where we need at least some standards. A lot of why we're proposing this is that a standards panel feels very arbitrary and harsh. We have four checkpoints before you could be sent to a standard's panel. It's a big communication thing with Laura.
10. Ben: I'm looking at the bylaws, I realize it's a high threshold before a rep is on probation (missing four in a row without telling anyone). It also says you can't vote if you're on probation. Is that something we're concerned about? If we're advertising important voting days that people will show up for, will they have attended the prior discussions?
11. Kessler: I talked to many advisors and getting over the hump of your first case helps with this. We could also strengthen relationships with SSOs which encourages attendance.
12. Cassidy: That's a great point. Responding to Ben, you would know once you've missed two meetings. Because you have to miss four in a row to be put on probation, there will be lots of heads up. And a plan could be worked out ahead of time. I don't think we'd get to a voting day where the rep shows up and can't vote.
13. Carson: I feel like four is a lot. Also, what is the incentive to get off the probationary status?
14. Cassidy: If you fail to meet your probation plan, you'd go to a Standards Panel and could be impeached.
15. Carson: Why four and not three?
16. Cassidy: We were trying to make it even with the SOs. But it's a lot and we're not tied to that number.
17. Thomas: There should be a plan for someone who only shows up every fourth time.
18. Will: I totally understand the part about not being on panels, but how do you square with the constitution? Each rep has one vote per the constitution.
19. Seamus: I like the proposal and this is a problem I flagged for discussion earlier this week. If we're careful with the language we can put it under the suspended rep status in the constitution. And to Ben's point, if if we have two people under suspended rep status, is quorum $2/3$ of 28 or $2/3$ of 30?
20. Penelope: I was thinking $2/3$ of anybody actively able to vote. I'm not tied to that.
21. Seamus: I ask because I don't know, and it's a constitutional question.
22. Cassidy: I think it would be problematic if they didn't count towards quorum and it contradicts the constitution.
23. Will: Can you explain the Article IV Section IV? It seems to be about representatives who have committed an offense which seems like a high bar.
24. Seamus: I think the middle ground is the category of suspended rep status. The constitution creates a category we can use.
25. Cassidy: That's how we read it, you can't count towards quorum. There are other things you could classify as suspended rep status.
26. Will: In Section III, you can work through each school's policies on attendance?

27. Cassidy: Ayda and I are currently held to the Student Bar attendance policies. We could technically be violating the code of ethics without knowing it right now.
 28. Laura: On Voting Days, those were just a short-term solution for quorum when we've set a deadline for a bylaw. In terms of someone only coming on the fourth time, maybe we just give people a set number of "misses."
 29. Seamus: A person who comes every fourth meeting is better than nobody at all.
 30. Penelope: We just wanted to open the discussion because it can be frustrating to staff a case with someone who hasn't been up-to-date on the policies.
 31. Cassidy: We thought about the set number of absences because you could blow them all and be out of the loop while still staffing cases.
 32. Ian: I like the four absences approach. Also, on reading the minutes. That should be required if you're not here.
 33. Cassidy: The idea is probation is the action plan. If you need extra support, we can work with someone via a flexible plan. Everyone should read the meeting minutes on their Honor.
- B. Discuss the potential consideration of student non-participation in Panels for Sanction
 1. Moved to next week.
 - C. Provide an overview and discuss the implementation of the new Sanctions Working Group framework for the Counsel for the Community
 1. Moved to next week.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. None.

The Committee adjourned at 7:54 PM and will meet next Sunday, November 10th at 7:00 PM.