

For quick overview, here are the [slides](#) from the senate meeting and here are my suggestions based on the meeting and a reading of the feedback posted on the website:

### [1. Using video in lieu of having a primary hearing independent witness](#)

There seems to be broad support for this. Knowing that things are recorded will make the instructor more mindful of fairness. Given that the student can bring along their own witnesses deflates the concern that the social dynamic is diminished because of one less person in the room.

### [2. A method for handling cases that involve many students](#)

Ideally, we would have a University office where the instructor simply hands over the evidence and let's others render the decision and sanctions. That would solve the instructor = judge+jury equation that is central to the JCC concern posted on the website. Blocking this proposal because it might risk making the judge/jury thing worse doesn't seem right. However, you might want to add prose to correct for the loss of instructor-student contact, e.g., "the student found guilty can call for a follow-up meeting to discuss the sanction before it is finalized. Such a meeting would become part of the primary hearing record." On the judge+jury thing, it was pointed out in the Senate that as faculty it is built into our role as teachers who give grades. Perhaps we put a line in the code that the instructor has to walk into the primary hearing with an open mind, no matter how compelling the evidence. The fact that everything is recorded will prevent the you-will-never-change-my-mind abuses that we heard about.

### [3. Giving the instructor the right to change the student's chosen grade option](#)

Very much like the idea of giving the S/U student the choice, e.g., "U or reduced letter grade." This would address the only voiced concern about this proposal.