

Graduate Concerns Team Report

The Honor Committee

April 5, 1992

Bill Allen (Chair)

Overview

The one word which best sums up the activities of the 1991-92 Graduate Concerns Team is dormant. The primary reasons for this state are:

1. A conscious decision to adopt a decentralized approach which allowed individual graduate representatives to identify and satisfy the peculiar needs of their schools; and
2. The lack of any single galvanizing issue which transcended school affiliations.

While some small strides in graduate education were made, there is a vast amount of work to be done for next year's team.

Progress

The Darden School held interviews in the fall to select a team of honor educators, whose duty would be to focus on honor education at Darden. Six first-years and a second-year were selected for the positions. The group, under the direction of University Honor Educator and second-year Darden student Carolyn Keating, administered a student survey in the fall and conducted a mock honor trial in the spring. The team penned a script based on one of the caselets in Darden's Walter Scott Honor Orientation case. A videotape of the mock trial will be made available in the Honor Committee office.

Recommendations

Obviously, there is much to be learned from this year's experience with the Graduate Concerns team. The decentralized structure did not work well. Much more centralized control is necessary to stimulate individual activity. In addition, the biggest challenge facing the graduate schools is education. More resources must be dedicated to the education of the graduate

population. The following recommendations should be considered when next year's team is formed.

1. The team should consist of at least one Committee member from Law, Medicine, Darden, GSAS, and Engineering. The bulk of Virginia's graduate population can be found in these schools.
2. The Honor Educator program should actively seek out greater representation from the graduate schools in their pool of educators.
3. At least one educator should be assigned responsibility for each of the graduate schools. For schools not represented in the pool, an undergraduate should be assigned. These educators should work closely with the Graduate Concerns team and the graduate Committee members.
4. Each school should try to develop an internal educator pool similar to the one implemented by the Darden School.
5. Goal and milestones should be developed for each of the graduate schools.
6. The chair of the team should not be the chair of any other Honor Committee team.