Roll Call

Absences were Colin Leslie (SEAS), Madison Busch (BATT), Marie Fleming (SCPS), Noah Egge (GSAS), Brittany Wengel (CLAS), Michelle Butler (CLAS)

Community Concerns

Mrs. Henderson from Families for Honor spoke to thank the Committee for allowing her to present Family for Honor’s ideas concerning plagiarism legislation.

Officer Reports

Brittany Wengel was absent because she was attending the first SACTH (Student Athletes Committed to Honor) meeting. She asked that Evan report that she met with the Inter-Sorority Council to discuss outreach methods for the upcoming Committee term.

Andi Chernau – there are six active investigations.

Conor O’Boyle – there is one appeal pending, and there is a trial on March 2nd.

Evan Behrle – three support officers looked into the proctoring policies of three other universities: Washington & Lee, Davidson College, and Stanford. He called for reactions to the research notes from Committee members.

Natalie Whitaker spoke to say that the Law school operates in a very similar fashion to the three highlighted universities. She gave the opinion that UVA faces the challenge of scale, since it is a much larger university than any of the three mentioned.

Colin Leslie asked if there was any follow up with CRDAC regarding their concerns with the logistics of professors being absent from the examination room. They gave the opinion that professors could answer students’ questions and could monitor the examination, giving students the opportunity to focus on their exams.

Patrick Shikani asked for somebody to lay out the benefits and costs of un-proctored exams.

Evan answered the question with three points. Firstly, at a school with an Honor System, students expect that professors would implicitly trust them. A manifestation of that trust is that professors will not scan the aisles of an examination room looking for cheating. Secondly, proctored examinations mark a shift away from student self-governance of the Honor System. Now that faculty make up the majority of reporters in Honor cases. Students seem to have lost a degree of tangible ownership of the Honor System. Acknowledging the cost that students might have to hold other students accountable while taking an exam, the benefit is exactly that, that students hold themselves accountable. Thirdly, there is a great deal of faculty concern over the state of the Honor System. Faculty feel that they are unnecessarily victimized by the Honor System. Un-proctored exams remove the possibility of professors feeling that they are unduly pitted against the student body.

Andi Chernau spoke to say that she was uncomfortable with the Committee speaking on behalf of all students without first seeking student opinion on the issue.

Evan agreed that we should look into student opinion. We could do so by placing a non-binding question on the student election ballot in March.
Josh Myers spoke to say that incremental outreach, such as a focus group, might be an appropriate and effective method of gauging student opinion.

Austin Sim gave the opinion that non-binding survey question has no real downside, and that there is no harm in placing it on the ballot.

Michael Billet said that adding a question to the ballot might draw unnecessary attention to the issue, while the purpose might be better served through focus group.

Joanna Will gave the opinion that putting a very broad question on the ballot and prefacing it by saying that it is simply a measure of student opinion has very little downside.

Laurie Axford asked if there had been a precedent to this decision, whether there was previously a non-binding question placed on the ballot.

Robert Carlisle said that there was some risk in losing control of the message if the Committee offered the question to the student body.

Conor O’Boyle stated that he sees the value in gauging student opinion on non-proctored exams.

**New Business**

Evan asked for each of the working groups from last week’s meeting to give a quick report on what was discussed.

By-laws working group: The group discussed appeal-related by-laws and decided that if there is a case where the Vice Chair for Trials decides that an appeal is an automatic and obvious ‘yes’, he or she may grant that appeal at his or her discretion without violating the by-laws.

Faculty outreach working group: Committee members discussed the possibility of introducing a faculty education module similar to the module that had been introduced to students earlier in the term. The next FAC meeting is on Wednesday from 2:00 to 3:00.

Diversity working group: Committee members discussed reaching out to minority students to discuss their thoughts and opinions on the Honor System.

Major events: Committee members discussed four topics: how does Honor work at UVA, how does the System work at UVA, specific issues within the System, solutions to the specific issues. There are four focus groups scheduled for next Tuesday and next Wednesday, with two groups running simultaneously.

Returning to the issue of non-proctored exams, Andi Chernau stated that she didn’t see much benefit for students with strictly non-proctored exams.

Brett Rappaport gave the opinion that proctoring of examinations is at the discretion of professors and that some professors might be put off by a student-issued mandate that prevents them from proctoring exams.

Michael Billet gave the opinion that a risk of placing the question on the ballot as a non-binding survey might make it de facto binding.

The Committee took a vote on whether it should present a non-binding question on the ballot for student elections concerning non-proctored exams. The count was 18 in favor and 3 opposed. The motion passed.
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