A. Guardians of the Galaxy Abstract Discussion

1. Chris: Why did the case take so long to get started
2. Michelle: Both from Honor Council and parties; Council had a lot of cases to deal with; some parties were away at some point
3. Jacob: What can Council do if parties don’t cooperate
4. Michelle: Could be done without them; not ideal since doesn’t address restoration
5. Chris: Did they eventually tell the person that it would happen without them? (referring to Amelia Earhart)
6. Jack: Part of the problem with Amelia was that she just left the school
7. Kyle: There was some communication in that case though
8. Chris: I wonder if they could have started without them in this case
9. Michelle: Especially ineffective without parties in social trial
10. Chris: Seemed like didn’t do much to restore parties
11. Jack: A couple things bothered me about this; parts didn’t seems to be living up to spirit of confrontation; Starlord not having to be at Rocket and Groot’s fact-finding; if it was a case where students weren’t equipped to deal with case and deans should have, or Starlord could have dealt with fact finding; resolutions trying to physically separate Starlord from Rocket and Groot aren’t in spirit of confrontation; if it was that traumatic, should students still be dealing with it?
12. Jacob: Jury recommended that Rocket and Groot talk to victim advocacy group; jury must have picked up that this was traumatic; can Honor Council tell confronted to do things?
13. Kyle: yes, but not binding
14. Michelle: Do you guys think that another form of trial (SFP, Joint Panel) would have been more effective. [explains trial types]
15. Kyle: Joint panel could have been good compromise
16. Jack: This was deterioration of friendship; different than if stranger had broken into room; I could see Rocket’s intentions, while misguided, were not as severe as if it had been a stranger. Part of me thinks it could have been dealt with on a more personal confrontation level.
17. Jacob: Sounded like Starlord really wanted to be away from him. Abstract hints that it might have gotten a lot worse since they couldn’t see each other for so long. How does Honor Council deal with Dean’s actions that could be damaging to a situation? Might have helped restoration
18. Michelle: Also seemed like Rocket was making excuses for not being able to talk to Starlord. Time before deans told them not to talk but after incident had caused down
19. Chris: I think mediation is a good idea. Even if it doesn’t work it could make the trial run more smoothly later.
20. Jack: I could see argument for making it joint panel since deans had already gotten involved; sometimes these things require immediate action
21. Jack: L question would be then whether involved dean would sit on joint panel
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22. Michelle: I would guess no

23. Chris: What could deans panel do better

24. Jack: Could have been productive to include the dean who had already be involved; deans have seen more

25. Michelle: Also if Starlord considered this harassment, deans might be more equipped for that

26. Chris: Seemed like they were using trial to get back at eachother

27. Jack: Could the way someone responds to a breach of trust be a breach of trust in and of itself. That seems necessary for a process to work.

28. Jacob: That was concerning to me. Sounded like Starlord wanted more “punishment” in tentative resolutions.

29. Chris: What’s the purpose of having someone live off campus; social separation?

30. Jacob: That was confusing, he could still can come to campus to do things

31. Jack: Think the deans did that since they view on-campus housing as a privilege that can be taken away. Generally used as some sort of punishment

32. Jacob: Any time deans need to act immediately, harder to have long run restoration in long term.

33. Michelle: Was it appropriate for jury to take dean’s resolutions into account (fact that they were living off campus influenced decision not to separate them)

34. Michelle: I think that its not ideal for deans and council to not be on the same page, but you have to take into consideration what has already happened

35. Maddie: Reminds me of situations where you have to take the fact that a party has already taken own time away since violation in separation decision, since being away for whatever reason might serve similar purpose to separation

36. Michelle: Would separation have been appropriate if Rocket and Groot hadn’t had to live off campus

37. Chris: Probably not after the fact

38. Jack: Probably wouldn’t have been helpful; they didn’t seem like the main obstacle in fixing breach of trust

39. Jacob: Are there abstracts where the jury says they would have separated someone but didn’t because they had already had to take time off? Seems like the were automatically supporting what deans did by not addressing what they thought should have happened

40. Michelle: What about the jury’s decision to report this to grad schools

41. Chris: Makes sense under rule of “if any other college would report it, we should report it”

42. Jacob: Seems like one of the more “punitive” resolutions. Seems like a big setback to have to report that. They probably just see that they broke into somebody’s rooms; then again they actually did

43. Chris: I think more could have been done to make this trial happen sooner. More important that other trials that it happen sooner. Should have taken precedent than less time sensitive trials.

44. Jack: Deans were already involved; maybe they could have helped make that happen

45. [more discussion of separate fact-findings]

46. Michelle: Going back to issue of this being delayed while other trials happening; I think its more appealing to Honor Council to run trials where parties are more responsive

47. [discussions of Honor Council procedure]