

HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES – September 3rd, 2023

I. ROLL CALL (18/27 present)

- A. Tyler Sesker - **Present (via Zoom)**
- B. Hamza Aziz - **Present**
- C. Jonathan Swap - **Present (via Zoom)**
- D. Laura Howard - **Present**
- E. Nishita Ghanate - **Present**
- F. Rachel Liesegang - **Present**
- G. David Armstrong - Absent
- 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 (via Zoom)**
- O. Alexander Church - **Present**
- P. Kasra Lekan - **Present**
- Q. Lukas Lehman - **Present**
- R. Daniel Elliott - **Present**
- 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 - Absent
- X. Skylar Tessler - Absent
- Y. Quana Dennis - **Present**
- Z. Matthew Bonner - Absent
- AA. Brendan Puglisi - Absent

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. William Hancock: Requests re-structuring of the tables to the previous U-shape since it is currently less open to the public.

III. EXECUTIVE REPORTS

- A. Hamza Aziz, Chair
 - 1. Update on Vacancies:
 - a) Both School of Data Science seats have been filled via their school election in late August; Hamza Aziz and the Executive Committee will onboard both graduate representatives, and they aim to attend Committee meetings beginning next week.
 - b) Ongoing efforts to fill the remaining School of Education and Human Development seat.

- c) Both School of Continuing and Professional Studies seats will be filled via a UBE election in mid-October, working with administrators to solicit interested candidates to appear on the ballot.
 - 2. SO Selections Update:
 - a) The second information session was held on Friday, with UJC
 - b) SO application closes on Sunday, 9/10 at 11:59 p.m.; please promote social media graphics.
 - c) The interview sign-up spreadsheet will be shared this week; individual interviews will be conducted the week of Sept. 18th. Three Honor members at each interview: 2 SOs/Reps and 1 SSO/Exec.
- B. Laura Howard, Vice Chair for Hearings
 - 1. Starting the hearing process for a few cases, presented at the SO O-Day Makeup training, working on AI Resources for Investigations and Hearings with Nishita Ghanate and Kasra Lekan.
- C. Nishita Ghanate, Vice Chair for Investigations
 - 1. 6 active investigations. Will need people to staff an Investigative Panel in the upcoming week. Worked on Safe Grounds transitions and the AI Resources with Laura Howard.
- D. Carson Breus, Vice Chair for Sanctions
 - 1. An IR Panel for Sanction will be convening at 8 p.m. to discuss 5 cases.
- E. Rachel Liesegang, Vice Chair for the Undergraduate Community
 - 1. Starting SO/Committee dinners this week; reach out of interested in participating
- F. Tyler Sesker, Vice Chair for the Graduate Community
 - 1. We are launching a new online co-sponsorship form on the Honor website (honor.virginia.edu/co-sponsorships) by mid-week, so it is no longer a Word document. Approved 2 co-sponsorships so far– the Third-Year Council Ring Ceremony and the UVA Triathlon Team.
- G. Lukas Lehman, Vice Chair of the Treasury
 - 1. Distribute the Honor purchasing card to Daniel Elliot for the Law school SO recruitment event.

IV. SUBCOMMITTEE & WORKING GROUP REPORTS

- A. Faculty Advisory Committee
 - 1. Brianna Kamdoun: FAC had some bonding time this week.
- B. Community Relations and Diversity Advisory Committee
 - 1. Tyler Sesker: Sending flyers and emails about joining CRDAC this week and early next week. Will have an initial meeting at the end of this month.
- C. Policies and Procedures Committee
 - 1. Tim Dodson: We will have the first meeting of the semester on Friday this week.

V. REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS

- A. Daniel Elliot, School of Law: The Law School will host an information and SO recruitment session on Tuesday. Our timeline for SO recruitment has traditionally fallen at a separate timeline than the traditional SO recruitment.

- B. MK O'Boyle, School of Law: Discussed the mentorship sanction further with Hamza Aziz, they will be able to implement the XYZ Case Summary at the end of this semester. In the spring, they hope to have the mentorship aspect implemented. Need more time to educate and explore buy-in from professors.
1. Hamza Aziz: The Panel for Sanction has fewer guidance/support documents on administering mentorship, but we hope it will be fully supported by the spring.
 2. Rachel Liesegang: Asks if professors will be chosen ahead of time to be potential mentors, or will the students select them on their own?
 3. MK O'Boyle: The idea right now is to have pre-educated, pre-selected professors ready to serve as mentors.
 4. Rachel Liesegang: That sounds great.
 5. Daniel Elliot: Are we instructing Panels for Sanction not to administer the mentorship sanction? Since we included it in our Bylaws, it would be fundamentally unfair for them not to consider it.
 6. Hamza Aziz: The Panel could administer it if they built the parameters and guidelines into the Outcome Letter. It is under-equipped because we do not yet have a pool of mentors.
 7. Daniel Elliot: On the record, the Panel for Sanction is authorized to consider this sanction.
 8. Hamza Aziz: Mentorship could be administered, just as any sanction.
- C. Brianna Kamdoun, McIntire School of Commerce: Commemorating a professor who passed away in the McIntire School. Is planning an event with the Commerce Council to do so.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

- A. None.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Review Code of Ethics

1. Hamza Aziz: It is in pretty good shape, but a few edits need to be made.
2. Laura Howard: Suggests adding the "Panel for Sanction" to the Committee member expectations
3. Hamza Aziz: We also may need to adjust the part about "at least one hearing" since Committee members must serve on the Panel for Guilt, if randomly selected. We can also add something about impartially reviewing all evidence at Hearings and considering all relevant factors at the Panel for Sanction in the Committee member expectations.
4. Daniel Elliot: There is a problem with our rules on compensation. Getting a gift card for Support Officer of the Month is compensation, and the Chair of the Honor Committee gets access to an endowed room on the Lawn. We can change this to "monetary compensation" and try to reduce the number of gift cards we give out. This would also apply to the swag we give out to SOs.
5. Nishita Ghanate: Can we change it to be from "any investigated or case-involved parties" and not the Committee itself?

6. Daniel Elliot: It's better to say "any source outside of the Committee," but someone's attorney could still pay you and not violate this rule.
7. Hamza Aziz: We should add "outside of the Committee members and school administration."
8. Alexander Church: Technically, Honor educators can be compensated under these rules.
9. Daniel Elliot: It shouldn't be.
10. Alexander Church: The document should be consistent throughout between support officer pools.
11. Hamza Aziz: Maybe we can move it under the "Support Officer" section. Now that educators will also be involved in the education sanction, confidentiality should generally be listed under Support Officers.
12. Alexander Church: Confidentiality should also be under "Committee."
13. Nishita Ghanate: Conflicts of interests should be "any Support Officer or Committee member."
14. Hamza Aziz: We will vote on this next week.
15. Adrian Mamaril: There is no clause here about favors or things you don't necessarily value but can use to incentivize action. If we only write about monetary compensation, should we consider this too?
16. Daniel Elliot: That's a great point. So, the language should read "compensation, favor, thing of value, or other benefit received in exchange for an aspect of your position."
17. Hamza Aziz: Overview of changes include adjusting compensation language and reformatting SO sections to apply to all.
18. Adrian Mamaril: Do the representatives from the Panel for Guilt go to the Panel for Sanction?
19. Hamza Aziz: Yes, the representatives all carry over. This will be ready by next week. The new Honor website will be launched this week as well.

B. AI detectors as evidence

1. Nishita Ghanate: We're discussing how we will investigate AI cases and what evidence will be inadmissible at hearings regarding AI. We want to interview people inside and outside of UVA with expertise in AI and generative AI detectors. We want to see what is more prejudicial than probative and what should be inadmissible as evidence. For example, what level of reliability do these detectors have? Should Honor ban the use of these detectors as a whole, or are they useful in some cases? So, we plan to start reaching out about conclusive ways to detect if AI was used on an assignment, how to do case processing with it in the future, and what to do with it at hearings.
2. Brianna Kamdoun: No AI tools are completely reliable. We should stick with what the task force recommended: telling faculty to refrain from using detection tools.
3. Nishita Ghanate: Point taken. We'll also reach out about other things to get the details of this topic and what the field looks like.
4. Daniel Elliot: Regardless of what information you gather, any procedure relating to the admission of evidence and use in investigations will need to be voted on by the

Committee and brought into our Bylaws. I think you should do whatever you want, but my inclination is to think that this will always be too fact-dependent to have a broad rule. To me, this sounds like something that has to be handled within each case, with the investigators getting an opinion from someone on the accuracy of the tool or for the accused student to use in their defense. All of this should go to the hearing panel on a case-by-case basis. This is the core of a merit issue that the Panel has to decide, so I would be concerned about making a blanket rule.

5. Nishita Ghanate: We're trying to figure out if AI detection software is so horrible that it's unreliable in most cases and to create guidelines based on what we learn about how these tools operate. We of course would take the input of Committee and vote on it. We're trying to make an initial report to present to the Committee. We're also trying to see if it's better to have an expert on call to testify about AI for cases or if we can have standard cases.
6. Adrian Mamaril: When it comes down to accepting the evidence and realizing that the evidence from an AI detector doesn't work, would you rather play a risky side and accept any evidence as a possibility, or play it safe and lean toward not using it, building out your understanding of it much more slowly? Many other committees that aren't student-run are working on this, too, so it may be worth seeing if there is any similarity across the board.
7. Kasra Lekan: I believe it isn't sustainable to have an expert come in and testify for all future cases. It also isn't sustainable to have a lengthy discussion if it's accurate at every hearing. I recommend that we draft some kind of jury instructions that outline how panelists should take in evidence regarding the detection systems. I would be opposed to a blanket banning of this kind of evidence. I think having some kind of consistent view for panelists would be useful. I think we should recommend to panelists that even if it indicates that generative AI was used, there is an inherent reasonable doubt. Just cause a tool said AI generated it, I would be cautious of panelists considering it.
8. Daniel Elliot: Those are all excellent reasons why it should be left to counsel in every case to make the arguments. I would be concerned about the Committee telling panelists what to consider. That decidedly goes against the reason why we have student panelists. This isn't a criminal system, but we took that model that sunlight is the best disinfectant, so people should have all the information. It's not more prejudicial than probative. The question is whether or not it is reliable. The jury should hear it, then hear why or why not it is reliable.
9. Brianna Kamdoun: Can you clarify? So you're saying we shouldn't have any sort of guidelines?
10. Daniel Elliot: I'm hesitant about having guidelines that say what is structurally allowed. For example, it is bonkers that we consider student-athlete status to be more prejudicial than probative. Having those kinds of high-level blanket rules fundamentally allows us to deliver due process. It is not constitutional if they are deprived of the ability to be heard.
11. Brianna Kamdoun: My concern is that our standard of proof is 99%, and these AI detection tools are 99%, so they will all be found guilty.
12. Daniel Elliot: That is not our burden of proof.

13. Nishita Ghanate: Is it a better goal to have an evidence packet that is about the reliability of detection software that counsel can motion into hearings? I'm unsure what the Bylaws would say about having witness testimonies without a witness being there.
14. Daniel Elliot: We can do it, but it is also murky.
15. Hamza Aziz: It's not a clear guideline, but it's a common set of information that either set of counsel can use to make their arguments.
16. Nishita Ghanate: It will be available to all counsel and panelists.
17. Hamza Aziz: Nishita, Laura, and Kasra are exploring this. Please feel free to get involved. Exec can also discuss training SOs for making these kinds of arguments.

C. Community Service Sanctions

1. Hamza Aziz: We talked about this in the spring, whether the student should originate the community service project or if we have set ones that we present to them. Do people have ideas for what community service opportunities could look like? Should P&P create examples?
2. Rachel Liesegang: We should contact these organizations and ensure they will accept them as volunteers. We should use their input and voice while assigning any volunteer work. Maybe P&P and Committee members can start having these conversations.
3. Alexander Church: Madison House has much more demand than supply, so that might not be a route for our sanctions. We should put that on the student since it may be odd for us to say that a community service project is available when it may not be.
4. Adrian Mamaril: I am pessimistic about leaving it to the student. There's a balance between us not being able to find opportunities, but it doesn't hurt for P&P to research examples. We can also connect them with an SO or Advisor to help them out in this process. It will take a long time to build these kinds of relationships.
5. Hamza Aziz: We can do more research on how other institutions implement community service on the ground.
6. Brianna Kamdoun: Considering the history of free labor at this University, we should not consider community service. But, if we do this, we need more information, details, and research before considering this. We should reach out to the Community and listen to their response.
7. Daniel Elliot: Asks if community service is currently listed as a sanction in our bylaws.
8. Nishita Ghanate: It is listed as "community engagement".
9. Daniel Elliot: If this is something we don't want to do, we need to take that out.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. William Hancock: I think the XYZ Case also counted as "community engagement" to P&P, so there is more encapsulated than the Community Service.

The meeting adjourned at 7:56 p.m. The Honor Committee will meet in person in Newcomb Hall on Sunday, September 10, at 7:00 p.m.