

**HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES – June 25<sup>th</sup>, 2023**  
Virtual Meeting via Zoom.

**I. ROLL CALL (18/23 present)**

- A. Tyler Sesker - **Present**
- 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. - **Present**
- I. Adrian Mamaril - **Present**
- J. Stephanie McKee - **Present**
- K. Brianna Kamdoun - **Present**
- L. Carson Breus - **Present**
- M. Tim Dodson - **Present**
- N. Maille Bowerman - **Present**
- O. Kasra Lekan - Absent
- P. Lukas Lehman - **Present**
- Q. Daniel Elliott - **Present**
- R. MK O'Boyle - Absent
- S. Brian Florenzo - Absent
- T. Lam-Phong Pham - **Present**
- U. Emily Brobbey - Absent
- V. Sophie Campbell - **Present**
- W. Skylar Tessler - Absent

**II. PUBLIC COMMENT**

- A. None.

**III. EXECUTIVE REPORTS**

- A. Hamza Aziz, Chair
  - a. First orientation session and Honor speech this upcoming week!
- B. Laura Howard, Vice Chair for Hearings
  - a. None.
- C. Nishita Ghanate, Vice Chair for Investigations
  - a. Selected support officer Alex Wei as an Investigation Coordinator.
- D. Carson Breus, Vice Chair for Sanctions
  - a. None.
- E. Rachel Liesegang, Vice Chair for the Undergraduate Community
  - a. None.
- 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. None.
- B. Community Relations and Diversity Advisory Committee
  - a. None.
- C. Sanctioning Guidelines Working Group
  - a. Carson Breus: Recently drafted a sanctioning guidelines document on potential sanctions, factors to be considered, and a draft outcome letter.

#### **V. REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS**

- A. None.

#### **VI. OLD BUSINESS**

- A. None.

#### **VII. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Non-Participation Update
  - a. Hamza Aziz: Talked to representatives individually about the “middle ground” for student non-participation, which includes mechanisms such as transcript holds and registration holds for having students decide to request a Hearing for Guilt or admitting guilt by expressly doing so or leaving the University. It also mentions the student’s right to a hearing in absentia, if they indicate that decision during their 7-day Hearing request window. In these circumstances, Counsel for the Accused will not be assigned. Most representatives are agreeable to this proposal.
    - i. Daniel Elliott: Asks why Honor asks students to schedule a Hearing, and why Honor does not schedule it themselves.
    - ii. Hamza Aziz: When the I-Panel formally accuses someone, they are given five Hearing dates to choose from. Offers to use language other than “requesting”.
    - iii. Daniel Elliott: Having the student submit a form for a Hearing seems to be an unnecessary step. They should totally be involved in choosing when it happens, but this seems to be a holdover from the old system.
    - iv. Carson Breus: Students can still admit guilt after they are accused, so this would serve as a step for them to not admit guilt.
    - v. Daniel Elliott: Yes, this just seems to be an administrative burden that creates more work for people. We can just move to a hearing, and if the student wants to admit guilt, that should be fine.
    - vi. Hamza Aziz: The Hearing request also gives us information we need, such as panel composition. “Request” does not make it sound like a given that we are offering the Panel for Guilt.
    - vii. Daniel Elliott: That information could be given at the Pre-Hearing Conference, or even another time. It makes it harder for us to do our jobs and for students to understand the Honor process.
    - viii. Hamza Aziz: What options should we present?
    - ix. Daniel Elliott: Yes, we can schedule a Hearing date with them, then get the information that would be in the form in other ways.
    - x. Hamza Aziz: Changing it to be a Hearing date that they select makes sense.

## B. Discussion on Post-I-Panel-Accusation Admission of Guilt

- a. Hamza Aziz: Students can admit guilt by leaving (“LAGging”), or expressly admit guilt after the I-Panel accusation, and waive their Panel for Guilt. In these circumstances, should permanent sanctions be off the table? As a reminder, the default is the full range of sanctions, and a 5/7 vote of random students can take off the highest tier, permanent sanctions.
  - i. Evan Pivonka: Do permanent sanctions mean expulsion, or permanent notations?
  - ii. Hamza Aziz: It means permanent removal and permanent notations.
  - iii. Daniel Elliott: It makes the most sense to treat admissions before the arbitrary I-Panel as the same as those that happen after it. It takes more administrative burden to treat them differently, and it’s not intuitive to the student body to do it this way. The student body will feel cheated if they still have to face expulsion after admitting guilt. It’s also not the default that everything is on the table– the default in the constitution is that they have the right to that vote. They should not lose that right because they have done the honorable thing by admitting guilt. Any time someone admits wrongdoing, at any point in the process, they should not be facing permanent notations.
  - iv. William Whitehurst Jr.: Agree with Daniel Elliott’s logic. We should still leave everything on the table, because we don’t know exactly how egregious the offense will be. Struggle why we would take that power of the Panel for Sanction away from them, because we can’t predict how egregious the conduct will be. It should still be a mitigating circumstance.
  - v. Daniel Elliott: If that’s the logic we operate under, we should never take permanent sanctions off the table. Honor stands for the idea that it is good when people admit to wrongdoing.
  - vi. Carson Breus: It would make things more administratively difficult if we allowed for this. The Informed Retraction is at the beginning of the Investigation, then an entire investigation and I-Panel continues. As the evidence piles in, admitting guilt may no longer be in good faith. Admitting guilt should lessen the probability of getting a permanent sanction.
  - vii. William Whitehurst Jr.: The consistent logic is to give it to the Panel for Sanction to determine whether or not to remove expulsion in all situations.
  - viii. Daniel Elliott: A student can admit guilt at any point, even during their Hearing. The question is the consequence of admitting guilt before Hearing. If someone chooses to forgo their right to a Hearing, they help the Committee by removing the largest administrative burden of the system, since you have to get all the food and get members of the community to serve as panelists. We should reward people for doing what Honor wants them to do.
  - ix. Nishita Ghanate: Honor is focused on rehabilitation, so we should lessen consequences for committing the infraction, but this should not be a question of reducing administrative burden.
  - x. Daniel Elliott moves to amend the Bylaws to reflect that students who admit guilt before the Panel for Guilt do not face permanent sanctions. Nishita Ghanate seconds it.
    1. Hamza Aziz presents a poll. 8 representatives voted in favor of the motion. 8 representatives voted against the representatives. 1 representative abstained from voting. After further thought, the abstaining representative voted in favor of the motion. Another representative who missed the poll voted in favor of the motion.
    2. Evan Pivonka: Even if you take an IR, you still have to say that you committed an Honor offense on paperwork, such as for graduate schools.

There is still a permanent aspect to these sanctions, even if the notation doesn't live on their record forever.

3. Daniel Elliott: That would be true of any sanction, from a letter to expulsion. It has more to do with the student truthfully answering questions to future schools and employers.
4. Hamza Aziz: Has received everyone's thoughts. We are more affirmative in the direction of removing permanent sanctions. The Bylaws we will vote on in totality will remove permanent sanctions from consideration for students who have admitted guilt after the I-Panel accusation.

#### C. Review Content of Bylaws

- a. Tim Dodson: Major changes included moving the investigation to occur after the student has decided whether or not to take an IR, the hearing in absentia, the mechanics of the Panel for Sanctions, the categories of sanctions, noncompliance with sanctions, and appeals for good cause and new evidence. The Panel for Sanction won't handle changing grades or regrades— that's in the faculty realm. Also, after being deemed non compliant by the executive Committee, and receiving several warnings, the student can file an expedited appeal within 3 days.
- b. Hamza Aziz: P&P will continue meeting throughout the summer.
- c. Tim Dodson: The Bylaws are an evolving document. It's possible we find challenges or unintended consequences, so we can craft additional bylaws or amendments.
- d. Brianna Kamdoun: Asks how many representatives were in favor of removing permanent sanctions.
  - i. Hamza Aziz: It was a 50/50 vote, then two additional people voted in favor (one abstained, one missed the voting window).
  - ii. Brianna Kamdoun motions to recall the previous vote because there isn't a strong consensus on it. Thinks that if we want to preserve the IR, we should include permanent sanctions but not expulsion when a student admits guilt after an I-Panel accusation.
  - iii. Daniel Elliott: For parliamentary procedure, we can have a motion to reconsider, which has to be from someone who voted in favor of the earlier motion, or we could have another amendment which replaces the other language.
  - iv. Brianna Kamdoun motions to amend the previous language concerning students who admit guilt after an I-Panel accusation to take expulsion off the table, but permanent sanctions remain. Rachel Liesegang seconds the motion.
    1. Hamza Aziz puts this information to a vote. The motion passes. Currently, if a student admits guilt after an I-Panel accusation, the Panel for Sanction can consider permanent sanctions, but not expulsion.
- e. Brianna Kamdoun: Having a rotating Appeals Review Committee may make it harder, we should give this system to shape itself, since it hurts our expertise.
  - i. Jonathan Swap: Likes the idea of having a set number of people, but letting others step in if there was a conflict of interest or if one of the Appeals Review Committee members was on the case. It is helpful to have them look through the same lens.
  - ii. Rachel Liesegang: Suggests tabling this discussion to a later date because appeals are not very common, and we must pass these bylaws before July 1. Motions to table. William Whitehurst Jr. seconds it.
  - iii. Hamza Aziz puts it to a vote. The motion to table passes.

#### D. Vote on Bylaws

- a. Nishita Ghanate motions to adopt the bylaws. Rachel Liesegang seconds the motion.
  - i. Tyler Sesker - **Yay**
  - ii. Jonathan Swap - **Yay**

- iii. Laura Howard - **Yay**
  - iv. Nishita Ghanate - **Yay**
  - v. Rachel Liesegang - **Yay**
  - vi. David Armstrong - **Yay**
  - vii. William Whitehurst Jr. - **Yay**
  - viii. Stephanie McKee - **Yay**
  - ix. Brianna Kamdoum - **Yay**
  - x. Carson Breus - **Yay**
  - xi. Tim Dodson - **Yay**
  - xii. Maille Bowerman - **Yay**
  - xiii. Lukas Lehman - **Yay**
  - xiv. Daniel Elliott - **Nay**
  - xv. Lam-Phong Pham - **Yay**
  - xvi. Sophie Campbell - **Yay**
- b. 15 representatives voted in favor of the proposed Bylaws. 1 representative voted against the proposed Bylaws. 1 representatives abstained from voting (Hamza Aziz, Chair). The motion to approve the proposed Bylaws passes.
  - c. Hamza Aziz: Will post updated/finalized Bylaws on website this week. Will be working with the Vice Chairs to update language, forms, letters, and other documents with the new Bylaws. P&P will meet again in a few weeks. We will all need to educate community members on these bylaws. Encourages representatives to think about school-specific outreach and will send out a University-wide email, likely in August.

Meeting adjourned at 8:01 p.m. The Honor Committee will meet next on July 9 at 7:00 p.m. via Zoom.