

HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES – FEBRUARY 25th, 2024

I. ROLL CALL (21/29 Present)

- A. Tyler Sesker - Absent
- B. Hamza Aziz - **Present**
- C. Jonathan Swap - Absent
- D. Laura Howard - **Present**
- E. Nishita Ghanate - **Present**
- F. Rachel Liesegang - **Present**
- G. David Armstrong - **Present**
- H. William Whitehurst Jr. - **Present**
- I. Adrian Mamaril - **Present (via Zoom)**
- J. Stephanie McKee - Absent
- K. Brianna Kamdoun - **Present**
- L. Carson Breus - **Present (via Zoom)**
- M. Tim Dodson - **Present**
- N. Maille Bowerman - Absent
- O. Alexander Church - **Present**
- P. Kasra Lekan - **Present (via Zoom)**
- Q. Lukas Lehman - **Present (via Zoom)**
- R. Daniel Elliott - Absent
- S. MK O'Boyle - **Present (via Zoom)**
- T. Brian Florenzo - Absent
- U. Lam-Phong Pham - **Present (via Zoom)**
- V. Emily Brobbey - Absent
- W. Sophie Campbell - **Present (via Zoom)**
- X. Skylar Tessler - Absent
- Y. Quana Dennis - **Present (via Zoom)**
- Z. Matthew Bonner - **Present (via Zoom)**
- AA. Brendan Puglisi - **Present (via Zoom)**
- BB. Jennifer Bowyer - **Present (via Zoom)**
- CC. Karl Frisch - **Present (via Zoom)**

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. None.

III. EXECUTIVE REPORTS

- A. Hamza Aziz, Chair
 - a) Honor Module/Video Updates
 - a. Working to increase themes of information ethics and self-governance as it switches to a new platform.

- b. Will start making new videos for Honor, both for the module and for the website, new way to communicate Honor-related concepts to the community; working with local media agency.
 - b) BOV presentation this Thursday at 3:30 PM to the Academic and Student Life Sub-Committee; it will be livestreamed. Encourages representatives to tune in.
 - c) Hosted a focus group with Karsh SAC which fostered a very constructive dialogue. A lot of Exec was in attendance. Part of our effort to speak with different student groups about Honor and multi-sanction.
- B. Nishita Ghanate, Vice Chair for Investigations
 - a. 3 active investigations.
 - b. Support Officer focus groups planned for March to equip next Committee with suggestions/areas for improvement, pertaining to case processing and internal/external initiatives.
- C. Laura Howard, Vice Chair for Hearings
 - a. Hearing today went well, thanks randomly-selected students and randomly-selected Committee representatives for their thoughtful participation.
- D. Carson Breus, Vice Chair for Sanctions
 - a. None.
- E. Rachel Liesegang, Vice Chair for the Undergraduate Community
 - a. UBE Voting event on Tuesday from 11:00 a.m.-2:00 p.m. on the South Lawn, asks for volunteers.
 - b. Held February SO Pool today; discussed confidentiality reminders, IR Panels for Sanction for Advisors and Counsel.
- F. Tyler Sesker, Vice Chair for the Graduate Community
 - a. None.
- G. Lukas Lehman, Vice Chair for the Treasury
 - a. None.

IV. SUBCOMMITTEE & WORKING GROUP REPORTS

- A. Policies and Procedures Subcommittee
 - a. Tim Dodson: We've mainly worked on a document summarizing the relevant bylaws for students who sit on Panels for Guilt. We're trying to make things more accessible and easier to follow, boiling down the core definitions for Hearings. It's nothing substantively new, but it is helpful to show people what bylaws are most appropriate. We also talked about the proposed Bylaw changes. We will have around 1-2 more meetings after spring break.
- B. Faculty Advisory Subcommittee
 - a. Brianna Kamdoum: Wrote new language for FAC in the Bylaws, will meet next after spring break.
- C. Community Relations and Diversity Advisory Subcommittee
 - a. None.

V. REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS

- a. David Armstrong, DARD: Introduces one of the new Darden Honor representatives

- b. Karl Frisch, SCPS: Planning 2 more Zoom events in March to answer questions about Honor.
- c. Carson Breys, COMM: Met with McIntire faculty last week and gave a presentation on multi-sanction to them.

VI. BUSINESS

- A. Hamza Aziz: These changes would all take effect on April 1, 2024. Begins by explaining changes to the VCUC and VCGC descriptions. These changes led us to codify the other sub-committees, P&P, FAC, and S&R, since CRDAC was already defined. There will still be standing sub-committees, and new language about temporary working groups. It also says how the Committee can create these groups as they see fit.
 - a. As for the new VCO position, they will work on finances and take on the Secretary duties and fill in a lot of gaps that exist on Committee right now.
 - b. As for the new VCGC and VCUC descriptions, they are much clearer and more detailed. They will focus on developing partnerships with communities and recipients of co-sponsorships.
 - c. Brianna Kamdoum: Asks if the VCUC will work with both graduate and undergraduate Educators.
 - d. Hamza Aziz: Yes. Reviews the definitions. Also added “Conscientious Retractions” to the description of the Vice Chair for Investigations role, who primarily intakes these.
 - i. Nishita Ghanate: Clarifies that the Vice Chair for Sanctions also helps ensure that CRs are complete.
 - e. Will Whitehurst: Proposes grammatically re-wording the FAC definition.
 - f. Will Hancock: Recommends including meetings with University administration.
 - g. Will Whitehurst: Asks for clarification on the shifts in the Secretary role.
 - h. Hamza Aziz: Currently, the Secretary is a non-Exec, non-voting position that anyone on Committee can take on. We are proposing to make the Secretary an Exec officer, the VCO, so they can take meetings at Exec meetings. We also kept the sentence about Committee being able to create other non-Exec roles.
 - i. Will Whitehurst: So, the VCO will be Secretary and Treasurer?
 - j. Hamza Aziz: Yes.
 - k. Brianna Kamdoum: Asking if the definitions for VCO and Chair are similar, in how they both “administer” the Committee.
 - l. Hamza Aziz: Suggests adding the phrase “logistical administration” to the VCO description.
 - m. Nishita Ghanate: The second sentence also clarifies what “administration” means in the context of the VCO.
 - n. Will Hancock: You could add the word “operations”.
 - o. Hamza Aziz: Replaces “administration” with “operations” in the VCO definition.
 - p. Nishita Ghanate motions to call the question on the votes. Alex Church seconds the motion.
 - i. Votes
 - ii. Hamza Aziz - Affirmative
 - iii. Laura Howard - Affirmative
 - iv. Nishita Ghanate - Affirmative
 - v. Rachel Liesegang - Affirmative
 - vi. David Armstrong - Affirmative
 - vii. William Whitehurst Jr. - Affirmative

- viii. Adrian Mamaril - Affirmative
- ix. Brianna Kamdoum - Affirmative
- x. Carson Breus - Affirmative
- xi. Tim Dodson - Affirmative
- xii. Alexander Church - Affirmative
- xiii. Kasra Lekan - Affirmative
- xiv. Lukas Lehman - Affirmative
- xv. MK O'Boyle - Affirmative
- xvi. Lam-Phong Pham - Affirmative
- xvii. Sophie Campbell - Affirmative
- xviii. Quana Dennis - Affirmative
- xix. Matthew Bonner - Affirmative
- xx. Brendan Puglisi - Affirmative
- xxi. Jennifer Bowyer - Affirmative
- xxii. Karl Frisch - Affirmative

B. Sanctioning Precedent

- a. Hamza Aziz: Opens conversation on how Panels for Sanction should use precedent. Anticipates that future Committees will talk about this, too, so we can provide input on it.
- b. Alex Church: It could be helpful in providing Panels for Sanction somewhere to start, especially in Panels for Sanction following guilty verdicts. It may be less useful in IR Panels for Sanction, but it would probably be very useful, even though we would still be considering the unique circumstances of every case. We would have to be careful with what information is kept anonymous and confidential. Some stuff is objective, which would be hard to reflect in precedent.
- c. Rachel Liesegang: We could start with our current public summaries, then beef up the sanctioning portions. We could include stuff about why they chose those sanctions for those particular reasons.
- d. Nishita Ghanate: Hesitant to use anything beyond public summaries as precedent because we may have issues with confidentiality. Committee representatives aren't entitled to know things about cases they're not on, and it could be wrong for representatives to have access to this information, if the students and reporters to the case don't have full access to it. Even if they have the information, would still be hesitant about having two levels of information, between what is shared within Committee and what is shared publicly.
- e. David Armstrong: Suggests having three different case examples for Lying, Cheating, and Stealing, and have two examples from each case for the harshest sanctions. It shouldn't be a big stack of information, since that could prevent them from using this information.
- f. Hamza Aziz: Clarifies that David Armstrong is asking for two filters—one for the kind of offense, then one for the type of sanction. Asks what level of information he thinks representatives should see.
- g. David Armstrong: Aggravating and mitigating circumstances, then the summary. It should take two minutes.
- h. Will Whitehurst: Recommends not adding aggravating or mitigating circumstances, since it could prejudice the panelists. Suggests sharing the table of sanctions with panelists and let them understand which circumstances apply to each case. Worried about double standards

- i. MK O'Boyle: Concerned about confidentiality and having two separate internal and external records. Mentions how everyone at UVA can access the XYZ Case Studies, since those could be a helpful tool for Panels for Sanction in the future.
 - j. Alex Church: For Panels for Sanction following Guilty verdicts, we were very creative and thoughtful. Worried that if we have too much precedent information, it could box in the Panels for Sanction and limit their creativity.
 - k. Hamza Aziz: Asks if Alex Church is suggesting use of external public summaries.
 - l. Alex Church: Yes, if that.
 - m. Hamza Aziz: We will continue discussing this in P&P.
 - n. Will Hancock: Suggests that representatives also look into the "Lessons Learned" section of the XYZ Case Studies.
 - o. Nishita Ghanate: Cautions against just using the XYZ Case studies, because there is bias within them, that only people sanctioned to them are writing them.
 - p. Will Hancock: They often also talk about other sanctions they receive.
 - q. Laura Howard: Asks if this would be an opt-in process or an opt-out process, and if students would be allowed to ask that their cases not be considered in precedent.
- C. One year since multi-sanction vote upcoming; year-in-review event/post?
- a. Hamza Aziz: Nearing the one-year anniversary of the multi-sanction Constitution passing. We are brainstorming what we can do to recognize the year past, maybe an Instagram post or an event.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. Alex Church: Encourages everyone to vote in student elections this week.

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m. The 2023-24 Honor Committee will have its final meeting in person in Newcomb Hall on Sunday, March 17th, at 7:00 p.m.