HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING
APRIL 3, 2016

I. ROLL CALL
Absences: Adam Buckholz, Brynn Cook, Laura Ochs, and Cabell Rosanelli

II. COMMUNITY INPUT
Senior Support Officer Allison Ivener (CLAS IV) added that having served on many Hearings, accused students are advocates for themselves. This is often lost on the student, and being viewed as a Counsel is really important.

III. OFFICER REPORTS
A. VJ Jenkins—Vice Chair for Community Relations, CLAS
   None.

B. Caroline Herre—Vice Chair for Education, ARCH
   Support Officer pool received a presentation on empathy from Helpline and discussed why they joined Honor. Educational Materials are coming in from outgoing orders. Staffing at Days on the Lawn Resource Fair is going well.

C. Avery Rasmussen—Vice Chair for Investigations, COMM
   There were several I-Panels this past week and many outgoing Committee members served. All accusations have been forwarded to the next Vice Chair of Hearings (Austin Sim). There will still be several I-Panels passed on to the incoming Committee. Avery is also working on a packet of information on the IR for the next Committee. Please pass on any comments to her.

D. Russell Bogue—Vice Chair for Hearings, CLAS
   There was a Hearing yesterday with a student found Not Guilty. There is another Hearing scheduled for 4/16/16 which the incoming Committee will be staffing.

E. Faith Lyons—Chair, COMM
   Emily Snow discussed the Review Panel composition, which will be made up of 10-12 people including faculty, alumni, past Committee, and current students. They also discussed the application process for the students at large and a nomination/appointment process for the faculty. Guidance and direction for incoming members was also discussed. Faith gave her update during the by-law vote/discussion (see below). Faith thanked the outgoing Committee for all of their hard work over the past year. She read the following quote from Dean Groves:

   “You have to be willing to be in two places at once, to have great respect for the long history and tradition of this place and certain aspects of that culture that I consider positive, and at the same time, you have to be willing to understand that the University has to be able to evolve and change. To be successful as a leader at UVa, you have to meld those two things together. You have to have the appropriate respect, and I would argue even affection, for really the unique culture of this place and its history and things like self-governance and the design of the place and the connection of students with teachers. At the same time you also have to be willing to say the University isn’t perfect, or has never been. So a slavish devotion to those things wouldn’t be particularly helpful and you have to be willing to ask how the University remains relevant and how it appropriately adapts to the times while retaining those qualities that make it
IV. REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS

A. Matthew Comey (BATT): Expressed that the incoming Vice Chair of Hearings (Austin Sim) should have a place in the script added for reading what the I-Panel is formally accusing the student of during the Hearing. Michelle Butler (LAW) and Sarah Rogers (SEAS) agreed with this sentiment.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. By-Law Vote: These will go into effect on August 1, 2016. All 3 Proposals passed:
   Proposal 1: Changing term “Advocate” to “Counsel”: 20 Yes/ 3 No (PASS)
   Proposal 2: Removing reference to “Attachment B” in By-Laws: 23 Yes/ 0 No (PASS)
   Proposal 3: Clarification of IR period for Degree Recipients 23 Yes/ 0 No (PASS)

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. P&P Hearing Audit Presentation: Grace Muth (CLAS) gave an update from Policy & Procedures, specifically in regards to the Hearing Auditing process. There were a number of issues that came up this year, but they were grouped into 5 major sections in this report:

1. Advisor Training (Jen Yeaton, incoming CLAS Rep). All advisors should have a meeting with the student at standardized times with standardized information given at these set time points.

2. Advocate Training (Matthew West, incoming CLAS Rep/Chair). With respect to questions asked at Hearing, Counsel tend to ask leading questions more frequently and this will hopefully be something that can be added to the Support Officer training handbook which gives a basic description of when leading questions are/are not acceptable.

3. Student-Read Closing Statement (Sean Padowski, Support Officer/P&P Member). Sean stated our by-laws currently say that a student can read his or her own statement with assistance from their Counsel. In the past students have read their own closing statements at the student’s request. Support Officers that are not in support of this fear that students may be emotional or excessively combative against other witnesses, which could unduly bias the jury. Adding a by-law change would formally recognize that the student is reading their own closing statement and this would be done at the Pre-Hearing Conference, so everyone is on the same page prior to the Hearing. Grace Muth (CLAS) added that this is a way to let all students know about this right. Michelle Butler (LAW) asked if opposing Counsel would have the opportunity to object at the Pre-Hearing Conference. Grace said yes. Austin Sim (LAW) expressed concern since most of the closing statement ends up being written at the Hearing so this may not be effective. Grace clarified that students are simply expressing that they wish to read their own closing statements at the Pre-Hearing Conference, not submitting an actual statement. Matt Comey (BATT) wanted to know if the student could change his or her mind after the Pre-Hearing Conference. Sean and Grace said yes. Michelle expressed concern that this may lead to inconsistencies in the process, which Russell echoed especially with respect to emotional concerns. Allison Ivener (Support Officer) expressed concern how anyone could possibly object to this. Matthew West (CLAS) says adding this language in would add an additional by-law change. Avery echoed that codifying this would limit the student in this respect.

4. Hearing Chair Instructions and Training: Grace said that there is currently nothing standardizing items like introducing the Hearing Chair to the jury, being professional, and addressing reading the Guilty verdict. This would ultimately add language to standardize these items in the Hearing Chair does well typically, but is not codified anywhere.

5. Reporter Evaluation Form (Sarah, P&P). This is a way to gauge satisfaction with the overall process. Many times people report a negative experience, but we never know why. The aim would...
be to address that concern with this updated form. The overall format is similar to the Panelist evaluation. This would assess the education beforehand with their general familiarity with the system. Michelle wondered about adding a place for sharing at future Honor events on this form. Alison Mehlisak (GBUS) pointed out that at Darden there is an issue with engaging faculty and this could be a potential solution in that respect to see why people are becoming disenfranchised with the system.

VII.  CLOSED SESSION