2/26/17: General Body Minutes

A. Attendance
   1. Mitch Wellman (Chair) - **Present**
   2. Jacqueline Kouri (Vice Chair for First Years) - **Present**
   3. Peter Bautz (Vice Chair for Trials) - **Present**
   4. Amy Ackerman (Vice Chair for Sanctions) - **Present**
   5. Alex Haden (Senior Counselor) - **Present**
   6. Emily Woznak (Senior Counselor) - **Present**
   7. Jenny Brzezynski (Senior Investigator) - **Present**
   8. Kim Medina (Senior Educator) - **Present**
   9. Kevin Warshaw (Senior Data Manager) - **Present**
  10. Sam Powers (FY Chair) - **Present**
  11. Emma Westerhof (FY Vice Chair) - **Present**
  12. Rebecca Sciarrino (Graduate Student Subcommittee Chair) - **Present**

B. New business/community input
   1. N/a

C. Graduate Subcommittee update (**Chair Rebecca Sciarrino**)
   1. N/a

D. Executive Committee updates:
   1. Emma
      a) N/a
   2. Sam
      a) N/a
   3. Kevin
      a) No update
   4. Kim
      a) N/a
   5. Jacqueline
      a) UF 16-11 moved to Hearing Panel
      b) UF16-21 Tuesday March 14th (right after spring break) - still need one more judge
   6. Mitch
      a) The Safer Communities Partnership Initiative (SCPI) met Friday for the first time
      b) 15 people showed up representing 8 or 9 different organizations in the community
      c) A UPD officer gave a presentation of some current police initiatives
      d) An Ambassador representative also gave a presentation on current operations
      e) The UJC gave an update of accused student demographics
      f) Next meeting will be some time in late March
         (1) No hard cap
g) I had a few cases, UF16-17 will not move to Hearing Panel
h) US17-04 and US16-09 please meet with me after the meeting
i) Just because new Representatives have been elected doesn’t mean they
take office yet, if you were elected you can still take cases as a support
officer until April 1
j) If you weren’t previously a Representative for the UJC, you can’t sit a
case as a rep until April 1

k) Transition
   (1) The week after spring break will be spent training new judges
   (2) The week after that will involve choosing a new Chair and Vice
       Chairs for the Committee
   (3) Q: Will new Representatives filling a vacancy in the fall have the
       opportunity to fill a Chair position?
       (a) A: Not if all four are already filled
   (4) If these vacancies are filled before the election, they’d still have
to be trained

7. Peter
   a) Pay attention to the Bylaws language
   b) Pass on any changes you notice to me or anyone else on exec
   c) We are scheduling cases right now, everything through the end of March
      is currently scheduled
   d) We will schedule cases for FY the first few weeks of April to ease UJC
      Rep transition
   e) Two cases the week
      (1) UF16-05 tomorrow meet after
      (2) US17-02 on Tuesday meet after

8. Amy
   a) No sanction updates
   b) I have a case this Wednesday UF16-11
      (1) I need to speak to Austin after
   c) Thank you for all the interest in the sanctions outreach I’m doing, it isn’t
      feasible for everyone to participate so I’ll be working to decide who will
      actually be involved with it

9. Jenny
   a) Talked about cases in pool and urged people to send e-mails out to
      clients as soon as possible
   b) If you have any questions let me know

10. Alex
    a) The Counselor pool went over standard procedures for hearing panels
    b) Check your cases and stay up to date with the ones you’re assigned to

11. Emily
    a) No updates

E. Presentation
1. Representatives results (winners listed)
   a) CLAS
      (1) Jordan Arnold
      (2) Jack Brake
      (3) Alexander Abramenko
   b) SEAS
      (1) Dan Donovan
      (2) Kevin Warshaw
   c) SARC
      (1) Jordan Richardson
      (2) James Strong
   d) School of Education
      (1) Al Ahmed - Undergraduate
      (2) Caroline Harvey - Graduate
   e) Comm School
      (1) Kimberly Flintsch Medina
      (2) Stephen Lincoln
   f) School of Medicine
      (1) Brielle Gerry
   g) School of Nursing
      (1) Lauren Brill
   h) Batten
      (1) Ellie Wood
   i) SCPS
      (1) (No contest)
   j) Law school
      (1) Brandon Newman
      (2) Peter Bautz
   k) GSAS
      (1) Will be determined in a separate process
   l) Darden
      (1) Will be determined in a separate process

2. Referenda results
   a) All passed
   b) Question 1 passed with 82.41% approval
   c) Question 2 passed with 83.40% approval
   d) Question 3 passed with 79.12% approval
   e) Question 4 passed with 85.12% approval
   f) These changes take effect immediately

3. Education requirements:
   a) Green Dot trainings will be available on 3/26 and 4/1
   b) Safe Space has several dates which you can see in your e-mails

4. Bylaw change summaries
a) Let us know what you think of the following ideas

b) There are two types of amendments: standard, big changes and administrative/formatting changes
   (1) Do not require Committee approval, just by Voting Members

c) Key ones to discuss:
   (1) Changes to Representative responsibilities and training
      (a) Currently the Chair sets up and the Committee votes on extra responsibilities (e.g. minimum trial number)
      (b) Adding the Vice Chair for Trials to this process
      (c) Currently Representatives set their minimum number of trials per month
      (d) Need a ⅔ vote to change the standard from previous years
      (e) This would allow the Vice Chair for Trials to set the number in consultation with the Representatives
   (2) Changing order in which Vice Chairs are elected (formatting change)
      (a) Currently Chair, Vice Chair for First Years (VCFY), Vice Chair for Trials (VCT), Vice Chair for Sanctions (VCS)
      (b) Supposed to be in order of rank
      (c) In practice case updates go on in exec so VCFT would be promoted to number two
      (d) VCFY would be moved to last
   (3) Change to Educator pool
      (a) In trials, we don’t see much in terms of the Educator role
      (b) Currently 80% trials and 20% outreach, we want to make this 100% outreach
      (c) Investigators could handle the Educator’s trial responsibilities and preserve confidentiality
      (d) Move Educator to a non-trial, strictly outreach role
      (e) Makes selection process for educator less stringent
      (f) This would also change the support officer selection process
   (4) How hearing panel evidence works
      (a) Currently can be any written statements presented by either party
      (b) Accused student can’t confront evidence brought against them
      (c) We remove that by only allowing the accused to submit written statements
   (5) How many people required to impose sanction in Trial Panel
(a) Fixing bylaws to reflect on constitution from “majority” to %

d) Break out groups

(1) Major points

(a) Pros and cons for each

(i) Educators offered some important insight

(ii) Part of the Educators’ role in trials is to give them exposure to our process

(iii) W/o exposure can’t educate properly

(iv) Mentioned this is an aspect of the pool that draws people in

(v) Could have rolling process of new Educators to shadow trials

(vi) Eliminate need for them to be in actual trials

(b) Discussion about number of bodies being limited isn’t too persuasive

(i) Educator is supposed to be a resource for people unfamiliar with the process

(c) Trials do serve a good purpose but the educators report becomes a formality

(d) Possible to let them sit one trial a year or to sit on the more serious cases?

(e) Everyone else seemed to agree with the other changes but one question was whether further cutting info from Hearing Panel would be sensible

(i) Currently the only information shared during a hearing panel is the Investigator’s report and statements from the parties involved

(f) Possibility of school specific Educators (similar to how our Representative body is structured)?

(g) Good practice to avoid appeals with % vote

(h) VCT maybe have second elected or let another VC run meetings

(i) Important to keep Educator’s survey to get feedback on how we can improve

(j) Right now it doesn’t seem like sitting trials is taking away from outreach or more general participation in events

(k) Would Investigator be the most appropriate person to administer feedback survey due to their current trial role?

(l) Would be worth giving people opportunity to change if the pool does change