

HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES – June 11th, 2023
Virtual Meeting via Zoom.

I. ROLL CALL (18/23 present)

- A. Tyler Sesker - Absent
- B. Hamza Aziz - **Present**
- C. Jonathan Swap - **Present**
- D. Laura Howard- **Present**
- E. Nishita Ghanate - **Present**
- F. Rachel Liesegang - **Present**
- G. David Armstrong - **Present**
- H. William Whitehurst Jr. - Absent
- I. Adrian Mamaril - **Present**
- J. Stephanie McKee - Absent
- K. Brianna Kamdoun - **Present**
- L. Carson Breus - **Present**
- M. Tim Dodson - **Present**
- N. Maille Bowerman - **Present**
- O. Kasra Lekan - **Present**
- P. Lukas Lehman - **Present**
- Q. Daniel Elliot - **Present**
- R. MK O'Boyle - **Present**
- S. Brian Florenzo - **Present**
- T. Lam-Phong Pham - Absent
- U. Emily Brobbey - Absent
- V. Sophie Campbell - **Present**
- W. Skylar Tessler - **Present**

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. None.

III. EXECUTIVE REPORTS

- A. Hamza Aziz, Chair
 - a. Met with every school's representatives with Tim Dodson and Kellen Narke about the Policies and Procedures Interim Report.
 - b. Finishing the website update, which will be live in the next few weeks.
- B. Laura Howard, Vice Chair for Hearings
 - a. None.
- C. Nishita Ghanate, Vice Chair for Investigations
 - a. 16 Active investigations.
 - b. In the process of interviewing an Investigative Coordinator with Hamza Aziz.
- D. Carson Breus, Vice Chair for Sanctions
 - a. None.
- E. Rachel Liesegang, Vice Chair for the Undergraduate Community

- a. Beginning to plan “O Days”, a day for Committee and Support Officers to meet, with Hamza Aziz.
- F. Tyler Sesker, Vice Chair for the Graduate Community
 - a. None.
- G. Lukas Lehman, Vice Chair of the Treasury
 - a. None.

IV. SUBCOMMITTEE & WORKING GROUP REPORTS

- A. Faculty Advisory Committee
 - a. Brianna Kamdoun: New Faculty Orientation Lunch hosted by the Provost’s Officer will be August 15th at noon. Also working with each school’s deans on syllabi statements on AI and explicit language for what is acceptable.
- B. Community Relations and Diversity Advisory Committee
 - a. None.
- C. Sanctioning Guidelines Working Group
 - a. Carson Breus: None.

V. REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS

- A. None.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

- A. None.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Review P&P Secondary Interim Report
 - a. Tim Dodson: Goal is for Committee to vote on new Bylaws on June 18.
 - b. Committee Question Results
 - i. Tim Dodson: Many Committee members are in favor of having a 72-hour window for the Panel for Sanction to meet after the Panel for Guilt. Under this suggestion, it is still possible for the Panel for Sanction to meet on the same day as the Panel for Guilt.
 - ii. Tim Dodson: There was general support for broadly defining sanctions in the Bylaws in four categories to provide flexibility. The idea is that the Panel for Sanction will use these definitions to determine an appropriate, fitting sanction. P&P has suggested that the Panel for Sanction use denonymized summaries, not as precedent, but to provide context of previous sanction, emphasizing that the Panel for Sanction will note the unique nature of each case.
 - iii. Tim Dodson: Committee generally agrees on permanent removal as the sanction for non-compliance. The logic for expulsion includes avoiding incentives for noncompliance.
 - 1. Tim Dodson: The Bylaws allow the Vice for Sanctions to adjust their sanction, if the student has asked for an accommodation due to a change in circumstances. The Vice Chair for Hearings will also account for extraordinary circumstances for non-attendance at a Hearing. The Outcome Letter will also inform the guilty student of the noncompliance sanction, and the Vice Chair for Sanctions will work with the guilty student to help them comply.

- c. Appeals
 - i. Expedited Appeals: Tim Dodson: A guilty student can file an expedited appeal when expulsion has been sanctioned by the Panel for Sanction, the Panel for Sanction has filed suspension, the student has Left Admitting Guilt, or the student has been determined to be noncompliant. The student can also file standard appeals within two years following the Panel for Sanction. P&P also proposes changing the Appeals Review Committee to be composed of five rotating members.
- d. Outstanding Questions
 - i. Daniel Elliot: What constitutes non-participation?
 - 1. Hamza Aziz: It is Leaving Admitting Guilt.
 - 2. Daniel Elliot: We need a new definition for LAGging, then. I don't think constitutionally we can have a bylaw that allows for expulsion for students who have been found guilty but are awaiting sanction. The student has the right to participate, they also have the right to not participate. It would be problematic to say that failure to participate results in the automatic expulsion sanction. We all agreed expulsion would only be used for when random students decided it should be on the table.
 - ii. David Armstrong: It sounded to me like the nonparticipation in a Hearing was a representation of a desire to not participate in the Community of Trust. I also heard today there was an unlimited number of appeals, and am wondering if that will pose challenges if the student chooses to make use of it.
 - 1. Hamza Aziz: The unlimited appeals for new evidence is a component of the old system. In an appeal, a brief is filed, and if a substantial question is raised, the appeal is officially reviewed. So, if the repeated appeals are not raising substantial questions, the appeal system avoids those challenges. As to if the guilty student is required to come before a Panel for Sanction constitutionally, should the Panel for Sanction determine the appropriate sanction without a blanket sanction?
 - a. Daniel Elliot: Constitutionally, the Panel for Sanction has to meet and take evidence from the Community, and make an appropriate sanction, in the language of our constitution. It is inadvisable to have a blanket sanction before the student has been found guilty, as well.
 - 2. Rachel Liesegang: In terms of using expulsion as a blanket policy prior to the Hearing, what should be the alternative procedure for LAGging?
 - a. Daniel Elliot: This seems to be a matter of terminology. LAGging means that they have been unenrolled from the University, so they cannot be expelled. That is different from not going to their Hearing, while still being enrolled. It poses no constitutional problem for them to be tried in absentia.
 - b. Hamza Aziz: A LAG has always been for an enrolled student who requested a Hearing in 7 days, then Honor removed their enrollment.
 - c. Daniel Elliot: Leaving the University is no longer the only outcome of our system. They have the right to be sanctioned by five members of the Committee, so we could schedule a Hearing if they do not, and if they fail to show up, then it's on them. Receiving the harshest sanction that is only available when 5/7 of students have agreed it rises to a level because they did not respond to an email is not right.
 - 3. Carson Breus: If we don't have some measure in place, the student could take advantage of LAGging. Will Committee members expel someone who

didn't defend themselves? It's better to have some official in place

- a. Daniel Elliot: According to our constitution, a Panel for Sanction has to meet. LAGging cannot mean a student faces the blanket sanction of expulsion. If Committee members will not expel someone who didn't defend themselves, they should be submitted to the process. It is a right, not a requirement, for the student to attend their Hearing.
 - b. Nishita Ghanate: It's similar to what we do in an Investigation— if the student does not participate, we keep moving on and working with the Community. It allows the student, if they change their mind, to rejoin the process, which could happen if a student is found guilty. It would be a massive aggravating circumstance for the Panel for Sanction to consider if the student did not show up to their Hearing for Guilt.
4. Carson Breus: What does legal say about this?
 - a. Hamza Aziz: If legal gives the greenlight for these Bylaws, do we still want to change our Bylaws? We have an extra Sunday if we want to flesh things out more.
 5. Lukas Lehman: In the last year, even though we haven't had any guilty verdicts, we had a different sanction, so what was our policy surrounding LAGs then?
 - a. Hamza Aziz: That was suspension.
 6. David Armstrong: It sounds like the way that it's been done has highlighted the fact that a student needs to request a Hearing and participate in the Community of Trust to have those privileges afforded to them. What is the spirit of what we're trying to do? Do we want to have students stay in our Community Trust who have chosen to not participate in the process?
 7. Daniel Elliot: The big point I'm trying to make is that, until now, there was only one trial for a student to have. Now, they have one right. Waiver of one right does not constitute the waiver of rights to both.
 - a. Rachel Liesegang: There shouldn't be a blanket sanction of expulsion for noncompliance. Noncompliance can be an aggravating factor.
 - b. David Armstrong: Your response is to have both convene, but have an addendum to those hearings?
 8. Daniel Elliot: We shouldn't skip over things. Honor has a responsibility in representing the Community to prove by a really high standard that the student actually did something.
 9. Laura Howard: Proposes removing the 5/7 student vote if the student does not show up to their Hearing, like with repeat offenders, where it is automatically on the table.
 10. Nishita Ghanate: I can see a scenario where a student doesn't show up to a Hearing, but we owe it to them to give them the chance to make their case to the Panel for Sanction.
 11. Jonathan Swap: We need to decide whether we will allow the student to have a PG happen without them being present.
 12. Carson Breus: A lot of students take advantage of the Honor system, and we should minimize that.
 - a. Daniel Elliot: The constitution doesn't care if the student takes advantage of the system.
- iii. Hamza Aziz: This meeting has emphasized to me that I need to speak with legal counsel. I can get clarification as to whether the Panel for Guilt needs to meet or

not. P&P combined noncompliance to the Honor process and noncompliance to sanctioning, and they're not as similar as we initially thought. By midpoint this week, P&P will touch base and see if the June 18 deadline will work, if not, we will meet June 25.

Meeting adjourned at 8:03 p.m. The Honor Committee will meet next on June 18 via Zoom.