Moment of Silence

1. Updates from Committees
   a. Social Issues Awareness Committee
      i. Sent email to student body
      ii. Also had a discussion on mindful confrontation - will host session in coming weeks
   b. Events Committee
      i. Hosting events: abstract discussions and community forums
   c. Abstract Editing Committee
      i. Editing abstracts
   d. Social Media Rep
      i. Doing promotions for events through HoCo page
      ii. Council members should invite people to to HoCo events on facebook
   e. Rep to JSAAPP
      i. Had first meeting last week
      ii. Asked if HoCo would co-host community forums with them
   f. Training Resources Committee
      i. Contacted a bunch of people to identify needs
      ii. Also trying to make abstracts more searchable by keywords
          - would have goal of building searchable database
            1. This would also help us do trend analyzing
      iii. Also trying to tabulate past trial resolutions that have Honor Council creating guides, etc

2. Discussion of alternative academic trial procedures
   a. Dela: Many people (including some professors) have brought this up over the past few weeks
   b. Arthur: Had thought of getting rid of finalizing if prof and student are in agreement with resolution
      i. brief discussion of what would be purpose of this
   c. Brian: Suggestion to approach this discussion in a systematic way; maybe go through each step of process and talk about why it is
necessary and what we can possibly do to change it
d. Sophie: What is the point of an academic trial
   i. Santi: One point is to hear both sides of the story (including circumstances), and then to come up with resolutions to help repair breach of trust
e. What issues do we want to address with expedited academic trials
   i. Arthur: In case where most of goals have been met and just need one more step that both parties agree on, we could expedite
   ii. Maddie: Bryn Mawr trials has hearings in one meeting (2-3hrs). That is other extreme
   iii. Leah: Not all trials should be expedited so as to not undermine procedure/reflection; only certain trials would be like this
   iv. Maddie: Some trials seem straightforward on paper, but things often come up during meetings that make it more complicated
   v. Arlene: Also, for clear-cut cases meetings are often very short; this already is pretty expedited
   vi. Erin: Professor in recent case brought this issue up; although it only involved spending a few hours in meetings, the case was hanging over his head between time of violation and when trial began
   vii. Santi: In many cases, circumstantial is a repeat of fact-finding; maybe we can combine those meetings
   viii. Dela: Circumstantial is useful for discussing potential resolutions with parties; still feel we would need to have this discussion after coming to a statement of violation
ix. Sophie: Still not sure what the value of an expedited procedure would be
   1. Leah: Having expedited trial would help us cycle more trials more quickly - addresses problem of delay between violation and trial
   2. Arlene: A lot of factors affect when trials happen - having expedited process might not necessarily change this
x. Dela: One way we could think of this is augmented process of dropping a case - ‘academic mediation’ - something where trial goals are almost there, doesn’t affect community to significant extent
   1. Jeff: Issue of that is we cannot implement binding resolutions
      a. Brian: Unless we change constitution at plenary
   2. Erin: Would this address issues where parties on same page but still legit violation to address

These minutes reflect the interpretations of Erin Lipman and Kyle Albagli, Co-Secretaries. They are neither reviewed nor approved by the rest of Honor Council. Questions/comments? Email hccosecs@hc!
xi. Brian: Ideas about why we might want to do this (expedited trials)
   1. Faculty do not bring things to HoCo because they feel it is not worth convening a trial; this might make them more comfortable coming to us
   2. Not let council get overwhelmed with the small issues - finite amount of weeks so things get pushed back
   3. Could make small cases less dramatic and scary for people
   4. Gives HoCo more tools to apply to situations

xii. Arthur: Might make decision about reporting to grad schools easier; things that go to expedited trial would likely be minor; this could be a sort of screening for grad school decision

xiii. Sophie: Agree with many of Brian’s points, but how could we tell from reading statements if an expedited proceeding would be helpful for the case; we should identify what sorts of cases don’t need a full trial

xiv. Leah: It is necessary to ask parties to share personal circumstances with 10 jurors? We would have to balance this with need to inform community, but depending on party it may not be necessary

xv. Jeff: Thinking about aspect of not having to get together 10 jurors - maybe something with fewer people - maybe have flexibility to shift to full trial if needed

xvi. Leah: Could have similar process but with fewer jurors - like SFP

xvii. Jeff: Maybe doing as much as we can in one day would expedite things, though still having reflection period between tentative and finalizing would still be useful

xviii. Brian: One thing we are concerned about is how to tell from statements, especially since people don’t generally know how to write statements - at Bryn Mawr, before hearing, they have senior counsel and/or head of honor board talk to people before hearing to try and get more information - we could do the same sort of informal information gathering

xix. Sophie: What sort of cases should not go a full trial?
   1. Leah: Less that trials are cumbersome, just that this gives us more options to have more customized approach

xx. Erin: A lot of times our procedures do not differentiate scale of violations; maybe distinguish proceedings for quizzes/small assignments and tests/larger assignments
   1. Dela: Very possible that large breach can happen a small assignment, such as if something is very malicious or intentional

xxi. Jeff: Criterion of do we think that parties have made steps
towards trial goals

xxii. Arthur: Similarly, do student and professor agree in terms of violation

xxiii. Dela: There have been cases involving a large assignment where student and professor are on same page about violation/resolutions

xxiv. Brian: Fact finding seems to be redundant in cases where it is very clear from statements what the violation is

xxv. Sophie: Although there have been instances where professor and student are on same page, but jury disagrees

xxvi. Jeff: There is a line between being/not being an investigative body, but juries should not necessarily treat statements as the absolute truth

xxvii. Arthur: Would rather have cases brought to honor council by having this less cumbersome alternate procedure

xxviii. Leah: Not saying this would be ideal, but technically we could combine all meetings except finalizing into the same day

xxix. Jeff: Addressing this with plenary resolution (as we would have to to change procedures) would allow for feedback/discussions with entire community

xxx. [Brian reads out some results from the survey conducted by Faculty Outreach Committee last semester regarding the reasons why professors may not report a suspected violation to Honor Council

xxxii. Dela: Still not sure if we are talking about a completely separate proceeding from a trial, or an easier way of running a trial

xxxii. Jeff: Maybe have a new proceeding, but have the option of sending case to full trial if necessary

xxxii. Audra: Going back to what Brian said about Bryn Mawr process; for cases that are unclear of how to proceed, we send case to four-person panel; they hear facts/circumstances of case and then decide if they can deal with case, or if it should be sent to full trial

1. Dela: When would this process happen? Most statements, or only certain ones?

2. Audra: Maybe cases where trial goals have mostly been met

3. Arlene: Also, both parties should be on same page

xxxiv. Levi: Maybe have a better method of collecting statements, so that they are more useful

xxxv. Jeff: Along with collecting statements, we could ask parties a list of yes/no questions (do you think a violation occurred? do you feel you are on the way to fulfilling the trial goals?)
1. Lynnie: Could also put this on website, especially for self-confronters!
2. Brian: Could also give examples of well written statements from past (with permission)

xxxvi. Arthur: Or we could write our own example
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