A. Committee updates
   1. First Year
      i. Facebook post thing didn’t work well -- nobody responded. We have another Q about finals that we’re going to post.
      ii. Just say the question! (Suggestion from Nicole)
   2. Abstract
      i. We did the things
   3. SIA
      i. Event about international students and how they interact with the Honor Code and the trial process. We met with many international student leaders. We came to the conclusion that the people at that meeting wanted more time to think and meet before we open it up.
      ii. Really productive and informative meeting. Current trajectory will having meeting with SIA, Daisy, and more international students with the hope of having a greater community discussion next semester.
   4. Faculty
      i. Daisy met with Philosophy Dept. Sounded that they thought the Honor Code wasn’t super relevant to their department. Was confusing. Continuing meetings. Last meeting for the semester. Next meeting will be writing a summary of themes
   5. JSAAPP
      i. Identified educational gaps
      ii. Tabling in DC with quiz. If you get this wrong, you will see the right answer
      iii. with Snowball being cancelled partially because of behavior of people under the influence, maybe you could hold a discussion about how people can behave better, and how does this intersect with other types of discrimination
   6. Marketing
      i. 2 abstract discussions - we’ll start poster for that
ii. Poster for Finals Week!!
   1. [Explanation of finals poster]
   2. Each committee could design a poster
   3. Outsource design competition to community?

B. Discussion on Transparency
   i. Someone felt that social cases should not be pseudonymized because social cases have broader impact, and a lot of people already know. Don’t necessarily agree. Still agree academic trials should continue to be pseudonymized but social cases should not.
   ii. Not a specific injured party in this case. Frustration on the side of accountability
   iii. Theoretically, I back the idea that when people commit infractions it should be totally transparent. If you’re willing to celebrate good things, we should be able to and willing to talk about the bad things. Practically, that doesn’t work because students would ostracize each other. Students would have to look at the educational trial process as a normal process.
   iv. If you could look at cases without taking personal sides, but everyone would take personal sides not based on the case itself.
   v. Also faculty would would be forever suspicious of that student and the accountability would never end.
   vi. Jurors try to get to that objective headspace so we can have full restoration. We can’t all devote the energy to being jurors every day.
   vii. Going through the trial process as a juror is the best way to understand how it works. I wish there was a way to have everyone serve on a jury, because that’s the best way for people to understand how the Honor Code is enforced
   viii. Making it more clear how our processes work. Trying to develop some situation where every person who goes through customs (everyone) has to sit in the position of a juror. They don’t have to be an actual juror, but putting yourself in that actual headspace.
   ix. I think that there could be a way where Co-Secs can keep track of how many trials a community juror have served on and specifically create randomized pools of people based on who has served on trials previously and who hasn’t. Maybe this should or shouldn’t impact who is on a trial, but it feels weird to have people here who want that experience, but don’t get to have it because they “were not picked”. Maybe we could have a system that is more efficient, where people can volunteer or that previous trial
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experience is weighted, but by chance, some people are placed on more trials than others
x. What if the email where you get first interest you send to a lot more people, and you could select “no, yes, enthusiastic yes” to filter for more people with more interest.

xi. Or “have you served on a jury before?”

xii. I like the idea of keeping track.

xiii. There are ways to make bigger changes, but I want to push myself to think about small ways to be transparent that don’t require a plenary resolution.

xiv. Transparency closely related to accountability. Electing us is super weird because when we come up for re-election, we can write that we did a good job, but nobody knows! I think everyone is doing a good job, but I don’t get to pick. The way we elect people whose jobs are secret is weird. There are periods where Honor Council has fallen apart! I want to look at those times and find out why it happened and how can we avoid them? Is part of the reason Council fails because we don’t have oversight. Part of that is the librarian.

xv. Lourdes’ school HC got elected through on-stage interviews. There was an option for writing it out if you didn’t want to speak. Then elected from there.