Honor Committee Meeting
April 14, 2013

I. Roll Call
All members are present excluding: Noah Egge (GSAS) and Jessica Alvarez (GSBA)

II. Community Concerns
None.

III. Officer Reports
A. Michelle Butler—Vice Chair for Community Relations, CLAS
   a. Co-sponsorships: We had a Word-Up with iLL-Literacy event on Thursday and Student Hip Hop's Cookout. We did have some representation at these events, but in the future, we’re going to talk at pool to see who can attend these events and hopefully have a bigger presence at these events.
   b. Upcoming co-sponsorships: We have two on the 20th: There’s the Asian Students Union Autism Speaks benefit concert at 6pm, and the Jefferson Society Restoration Ball. For the latter, the first twenty people on Committee and the support officer pools can go for free.
   c. Faculty reception is on Tuesday – 33 RSVPs for yes right now. If you haven’t RSVP-ed to Michelle yet, do so.
   d. We’ve also been working on the roundtable even – see Evan’s report.
   e. We’ve also been working on the website, since there’s not much information on the IR yet, so we are working on several drafts.
   f. Community Relations Committee will be structure differently this year – we will make it representative of different CIOs, frame it along the lines of “congrats” we want you to be on the CRC, and we want your opinion. We have also considered folding DAB in the CRC to get the minority opinion in there, especially since right now we don’t have a chair for DAB. So Pat Lampkin would send out emails to different individuals in groups congratulating them into being selected for CRC, etc. “If you would like to select someone in your stead,” that would be okay too. Folding DAB into the CRC is going to be a bylaws change, so we would have to vote on that
      • Andi: Yes, this will help DAB be more involved and express their opinions.
      • Brittany: Just to clarify, would DAB be “DAB” or a part of the CRC?
      • Austin: I think branding is an important factor.
      • Brittany: I’m not sure, it can go either way, in terms of legitimacy in general and effectiveness.
      • Michelle: They would just be a member of the CRC, not DAB specifically.
      • Andi: It’s important for DAB to be in their own group, their own subgroup within the CRC, especially with our emphasis on spotlighting. DAB would still be a subgroup dedicated to that.
      • Will: For the bylaws change, would that be permanent until changed? My concern with that: it takes a problem from this year, that DAB this year is small, and folding it as a permanent change for future years, how
will we know that is an appropriate change for future years? I’m in favor of continuing a DAB, because this organization claims to represent the student body at UVA, and there should be efforts directed towards diversity advisory.

- Michelle: When we talked about restricting DAB, it would have been modeled after this similar structure, and that is involved with the appointments modeling. We were afraid that, if we had them completely separately it would seem that we have two advisory groups: CIOs that are largely white on one, and minorities on another. We want to bring diversity opinions into the general, and not have them segregated. But I understand your concerns.
- Evan: We will be voting on this next week with the other bylaws changes.
- Austin: What are the overlaps and parts that don’t overlap?
- Michelle: CRC hasn’t really been in use since I was in Honor, so it’s based on how we see it. We want to expand it to more organizations.
- Austin: Why can’t we just expand DAB? What’s the problem with that?
- Brittany: It might turn non-diversity groups away?
- Michelle: We definitely want it to be more broad, especially since we had an opposition group (Student Honor Caucus), and this is a good agreement.
- Sam: Since branding is important and we want to show that this is something that we value highly, is it better to have a Diversity working group within the CRC, or something along the lines of making it the “community and diversity” committee? Would making a separate subcommittee, would blending them together or separating the two, run into problems? Would some of the concerns of blending it together would be that the message would get lost? Have DAB slots within it?
- Michelle: There should have diversity reps within the CRC.
- Evan: You would pick a set of CIOs, and then have a DAB position, where, for example, the Vice President of all organizations would automatically be part of the CRC, or appoint someone else instead. So we would have all of the organizations that we want in DAB type of organization, but also include all other organizations that are predominantly white.
- Sam: So what would those slots be called? Would they be called DAB slots? Especially to maintain the diversity emphasis, add a title level?
- Evan: I would push back a little bit on the idea of calling someone from BSA a “diversity” representative and not calling someone from SHC a diversity rep, because that’s working with a pretty narrow definition of diversity, which we do work with spotlighting that often operates on the traditional visual level. If it was clear which organization everyone came from, so they were the voices of their particular groups and not diversity per se, VSA, U-Guides, Jeff Soc, large groups, etc., that capture various sectors of student opinion.
Brittany: Have different groups, student government, athletes, that represent large sections of the student population, so we don’t just single out minority groups or else it seems as if we are targeting them.

B. Brittany Wengel—Vice Chair for Education, CLAS
   a. I’ve finished meetings with all groups, and last meeting is after this. Lots of great ideas and fruitful discussions on how to integrate Honor, I will send out all of my notes later so you can also see ideas of other schools for the year to come.
   b. This past week, 10 students from University of Edinburgh as part of an emersion program were here on Tuesday morning to understand American Higher education. They were seeing lectures, going to DC, etc, understanding the university experience, and they wanted to learn about Honor. It was interesting to hear a discussion with them and the notion of the single sanction and the Community of Trust.
   c. We had out second SACH summit last week – Student Athletes Committed to Honor. The format of this is like the model for our new DAB or community committee. Coordinators nominated rep from each team. This is the second we had, we had really great discussion about what Honor is and the IR, how honor manifests itself within athletics. We discussed their experiences, and discussed ways that they could step up in their teams and buy-in to a certain extent.
      • Laurie: How many attended?
      • Brit: Only 12 attended, others were traveling, they were all talking to each other since there were smaller numbers. The ones there were really engaged. We might reschedule it.
   d. Hispanic Town Hall – the following Tuesday, this will be basically a sustained dialogue forum. It depends on the number of people who show up (use RSVP to gauge), we will pitch question out to everyone, discuss in small groups and a big group, tie in the IR and it was sent out to all Hispanic/ Latino community groups so they can understand the system better and be better involved. It’s a great touch point for us to engage their views on our system. You are welcome to attend, 5:30pm. 22nd. There will be food, it’s here in Newcomb, should last around an hour.
      • Austin: Was this sent out to graduate Hispanic/Latino too?
      • Brittany: Will check.

C. Andi Chernau—Vice Chair for Investigations, SED
   a. We currently have 4 active investigations, and a lot of investigations are finishing up this week, so I will send out I- Panels and scheduling within the end of this week.
   b. One of the holes we have in the bylaws with IR is there’s nothing mentioned on how the IR interacts with the CR. I talked with Rachel, our legal advisor, on how we should account for this. I think that if a student files a CR, and it’s deemed complete, and then later a report comes in. We’re going to have an I-Panel on the validity (preliminarily), since the I-Panel determines the validity, if this was in good faith, of the CR. The VCI only determines completeness. If it is deemed valid, then the student circumvents Honor. If it’s invalid, then the student has
the opportunity to file the IR to continue the seven days from there. Rachel agreed with me.

- Austin: I think that’s fair.
- Andi: This would be erring on the side of the student’s best interest.
- Sam: So with the CR/IR overlap, would students get the fruits of the investigation before submitting the IR? Rebuttals and stuff too?
- Andi: There would be a limited investigation, and only on validity. So the I-Panel would only be voting on validity, and there would be another I-Panel that decides on whether or not to accuse or drop the case, if the CR is invalid.
- Sam: So would there be another investigation after the first I-Panel? Call back the witnesses, etc?
- Andi: That’s something else to discuss, would we want to have Counsel first conduct an interview analyzing the validity, and then have an interview on the facts of the case? So that way the Professor doesn’t have to meet three times with the Counsel?
- Evan: Typically it’s pretty simple logistically to justify/investigate validity. This would be another bylaws change.

D. Conor O’Boyle—Vice Chair for Trials, CLAS
a. There was nothing this weekend, we have one trial coming up this Sunday, the 21st, I will be observing and Austin will be the Trial Chair. Email Conor if you want to shadow for educational purposes.

b. On Sunday the 28th there’s another trial (day after Foxfields). Katie will be the trial chair, and Evan will be the official observer. Email if you want to shadow.

E. Evan Behrle—Chair, CLAS
a. The nameplates are coming in this week, we changed the font so it’s not all caps and it’s Garamond.

b. Brittany and I met with Tabatha Enok who is the Director for the Office for New Student Programs, they coordinate the undergraduate orientations in the summer and first two weeks of fall, and started laying out what orientation is going to look like for undergrads in the summer. Over the next couple of weeks, in addition to the bylaws change, that’s going to be our priority, especially since the graduate students come in earlier than we do, and we want to hammer out the details of every orientation, scrolls, who is speaking, etc. We want to do more preparation for these things now.

c. Roundtable panel and the IR email are tied together.

d. The IR email will be sent to all faculty, staff, and students mid-afternoon tomorrow, and it serves three purposes:

i. Legal purpose of notice: students need to understand what system they are governed by.

ii. Lays out the philosophical underpinnings of the IR, why it exists and how it passed, giving deference to how it was passed (student self-governance).

iii. Includes an RSVP form for the Roundtable discussions, to discuss the IR and the future of Honor at the university, we have a panel discussion:
this Thursday, tentatively slated for 4:30pm at the UVA Chapel. This email is going to 30k people, may get many RSVPs, may need to get moved to other location (larger spaces) if many people RSVP.

e. The composition of the Roundtable panel is:
   1. Dean of Students Allen Grove
   2. Professor Sherri Moore from the Comm School
   3. Eric McDaniel, StudCo President
   4. Forrest Brown, Cav Daily reporter and Students Honor Caucus, who opposed our referendum.
   5. And Rachna who is a former president of ASU and opposed it too.
   6. Me (Evan Behrle).

f. I talked to support officers today to see how the format they would like to see.
   In the first Roundtable event earlier this year, there was a moderator and the panelists asked five pre-written, set questions. Given that we have 1 hour to 1.5 hours in the Chapel, what should be the best format for this time?
   • Marie: When we are sending out emails, maybe also ask them to send questions that they want answered about it, so there will also be questions from the student body who wants to attend. Solicit them ahead of time.
   • Laurie: Also videotape it, so you can broadcast to students who are not on grounds.
   • Sam: Is there a moderator?
   • Evan: Dean Groves was a moderator last time, but he’s a panelist this time, I considered having no moderator this time, but it’s easier logistically to have a moderator, like Frank Dukes. Or, since there’s not going to be much back or forth it could be an administrative (in the general sense) moderator, even a Committee member. What role would the moderator play?
   • Sam: It would make it easier, and to facilitate some back and forth. Would being in the chapel (more intimate environment than Old Cabell hall) be better for discussion and audience participation? A moderator would be able to better moderate that rather than the panelists themselves.
   • Marie: Moderator is a really good idea, and also have some audience participation, maybe at the end to allow 10-15 minutes for questions.
   • Brittany: Since we already have question soliciting, this is already a community event, because they will have the opportunity to submit questions ahead of time, and they will be answering community questions. And this will be videotaped.

g. The date is this Roundtable is Thursday, the 18th, 4:30pm. We are waiting to hear back for Dean Groves, and he might not be available until 5:00pm. We will have posters, but it will be logistically difficult to have physical posters since the details won’t be finalized until tomorrow morning, and since we can email them, 30k people, and there will be a facebook event. Please invite your facebook friends. We will have the poster as a picture for the event. I don’t think we need to put up physical posters.
Conor: Can we advertise that students can submit questions in advance? Maybe as part of the advertising? The questions in the fall may not have been as provocative as students wanted them to be.

Evan: We could post up sample questions on the facebook event. The Facebook link would probably not be on the invite rather than just a simple RSVP. There’s lot of constraints for what you can send out in an email to the whole University.

Michelle: Are we going to have a link to the video, if we are going to post it up? Where we can stream it to?

Austin: We will post it up on the Internet, we can tell them that it will be up on our website.

Evan: hesitant to use tech that we haven’t used yet, if something falls through.

Austin: The link will be on Youtube, and we can put it up on the site. There’s also a lot of digital media, in Newcomb, etc. we can do that type of thing.

Michelle: We have to send the request two weeks in advance.

Evan: This had to come pretty quickly, due to pre-finals week. EngageUVA sends out a list of engaging events to students each week, and that’s the prime form of digital outreach that gets sent out to many students.

IV. Old Business
   A. Informed Retraction By-laws Discussion
      a. Evan previously sent out an email about the IR and due process: there is a huge constraint on how much information students can receive when considering the IR. Last time, Conor talked about the nexus of events.
         • Conor: Based on the way that the old Committee wrote the bylaws, they were concerned about what would happen if there were reports about two different Honor Offenses, and if you could take one IR. Right now it says: “If a student is concurrently reported for multiple Honor Offenses that result from the same nexus of events or in which the facts surrounding the case are inextricably linked, in the sole, reasonable discretion of the Vice Chairs, the student may submit an IR covering all such alleged Honor offenses.” There are many models of interpretation for this. Say, if you are taking an online exam, and you have to check a box saying you took five hours to complete and you can’t submit the assignment unless you check that box, if you take 6 hours, you are lying about the amount of time and also cheating by taking 6 hours. So philosophically, you do both, and we think that those should be covered under the same IR. And then what about, when the professor discovers you cheating on the final, and finds that you also cheated on the midterm after becoming suspicious because of the final. According to the bylaws, the VCI could decide that these are under the same offense since they are explicitly linked, and you can’t discover one without the other. Another situation that could be
considered together: if you cheat on a test, and then lie about it the next day to your professor, you can’t lie without cheating in the first place. Last year’s committee thought those two should be linked and covered every time, but Evan and I think those should be different offenses, that you can cheat and not lie.

- Evan: the spectrum is when the two potential acts are mutually dependent, so you can’t have one without the other in either direction; the middle scenario is that they are dependent on one scenario; and the third scenario (midterm, final scenario) is when they are not dependent at all, but they were discovered by looking at the first and the second, but the actual acts are separate. In terms of interpretation, after speaking to Rachel, right now the bylaws suggest we grant one IR to the first two scenarios, the two co-dependent scenarios, but there is some interpretative leeway with the third scenario. At the discretion of the VCT and VCI, those two could be two separate acts, and you can only cover one of these. The text says, “surrounding such alleged Honor offenses,” and if you look at this literally, those are the facts surrounding the potential offenses, not the actual discovery of the offenses, not the commission of the act. What would be appropriately covered by one scenario? We could just change the bylaws for the second. The three are:
  1. Co-dependent,
  2. Dependent on one direction, cheat then lie.
  3. Two separate acts that were discovered together.

- Andi: What’s troubling about the second scenario, cheating then lying, is that the essence of the IR is that you come forward and admit it. If you’re lying when you had the opportunity to come forward, that’s not the same as the IR.

- Natalie: I agree with that.

- Conor: It would have to be the case that you would have to cheat, lie about the cheating, and then there would be some type of conclusive photographic, etc, evidence to show that both of these are correct and go to trial.

- Evan: It would have to be explicit lying in the face of explicit evidence.

- Sam: I agree with Andi and Natalie, that it undermines the purpose of the IR. Would it be okay or make sense to just leave the language “If a student is concurrently reported for multiple Honor Offenses that result from the same single nexus of events,” and then cross out “in which the facts surrounding the case are inextricably linked”? If we think scenarios two and three should be covered in the context of a single IR, I think we need that language in there; if they shouldn’t be covered, then just get rid of that language. The single nexus of events would cover scenario 1 and not scenarios 2 and 3.

- Evan: It would cover 1, and maybe you could interpret it to cover 2 (we have leeway). It’s resolved from the same nexus, we have some flexibility.
• Will: I can’t think of a realistic situation for the first scenario, in which someone would be realistically charged for those offenses.
• Evan/Conor: it’s happened before, this is a real example.
• Brett: I’ve of the opinion that it’s a stressful situation when you get reported, and the decision to take an IR is your recommitment to the honor system, and when you come back you won’t cheat again. If you cheated again or twice, if you take the IR it should wipe out all of your wrongdoings in the past. I disagree with Andi, and I think all three of these situations should be allowed since you are re-committing yourself by taking the IR.
• Patrick: So you believe in multiple IRs over several months? (Brett: No.) What if they are just a few days apart but not a nexus of events? It is hazy how many we have. (Brett: If they got reported for two Honor offenses, we let them take one IR and not the other, so they don’t get to take a leave of absence and they have to go to trial.
• Evan: They must be found guilty.
• Marie: Everything is up to debate for the Vice Chairs, whether the IR can be submitted, I have no qualms with all three being put in there.
• Andi: There should be some consistency. But I see how it’s a mentality, an attitude, and how having an IR time would change that. Does it make sense, if you are found guilty?
• Marie: I agree with Andi, I’m on the fence too, because at that point are you just taking a plea deal?
• Evan: In that sense, you are, which offense you are taking an IR for, and which you are going to trial for. But that’s just a reality of how the IR plays out. There should be a stress surrounding the first act of cheating (not so much for the third scenario) so I am on the fence for the second, and think it shouldn’t be for the third situation.
• Brett: Definitely for the second situation. It’s easier to come forward and admit your lie if you have this IR option than being confront by professor.
• Natalie: I don’t remember the language, but I recall an Honor restart button for a single event, a singular event, and not all Honor events committed in the past.
• Evan: This is a singular, but you’re right, maybe the student vote doesn’t even affect the third situation, the nexus of events.

b. Date of the Honor Leave of Absence
• Evan: One other matter that I have: Katie and Rachel and I talked about the exact date when the Honor leave of absence would start to make it most logical and efficient. What makes the most sense to have it match up to a year is to have an Honor probation for the duration of the semester after your IR submitted, and the day after that semester ends, that’s when the Honor leave of absence will begin then, not the first day of the next semester as is it is written now. Right now, it suggests that you can register for classes for J term and Summer term once the Honor probation starts, but we would have to go through the
registrar. Right now, the Honor probation doesn’t affect your status as a student. So even though it says you can’t take classes, you sort of have the ability to enroll in a class. In terms of our relationship with the registrar, this will start the day after the semester ends, and then it will end 364 days later so you could enroll in summer classes the year after you take the IR, going into the fall semester if you took it in the spring.

c. Formatting Issues with the IR
   • Sam: In our binders, the Informed Retraction is listed as section B, and in the papers it say B, Retraction. When we make these temporary bylaws permanent, will we delete up to “1. Purpose”?
   • Evan: This is fixed now. Yes. Not all work is done in Committee. Feel free to submit opinions on smaller issues to Exec in the coming days, just send us an email. The section on the Dean of Students has been entered into the rough draft form as well.

V. New Business
   F. Change in Notice policy (Evan Behrle—Chair, CLAS)
      a. After speaking with Rachel, for almost every other university functionary: email is a form of notice and communication, so we have the capacity to change the way that we give official notice. This will be another bylaw change. So students can list their email address as their “primary address” rather than an actual house address. So they will get things easily and also to their house address too if needed.

VI. Community Concerns
None.

VII. Closed Session