I. ROLL CALL (20/27 present)
   A. Tyler Sesker - Present
   B. Hamza Aziz - Present
   C. Jonathan Swap - Present (via Zoom)
   D. Laura Howard - Present
   E. Nishita Ghanate - Present (via Zoom)
   F. Rachel Liesegang - Present
   G. David Armstrong - Present (via Zoom)
   H. William Whitehurst Jr. - Absent
   I. Adrian Mamaril - Present (via Zoom)
   J. Stephanie McKee - Absent
   K. Brianna Kamdoum - Present
   L. Carson Breus - Present
   M. Tim Dodson - Absent
   N. Maille Bowerman - Present (via Zoom)
   O. Alexander Church - Present
   P. Kasra Lekan - Present (via Zoom)
   Q. Lukas Lehman - Present
   R. Daniel Elliott - Absent
   S. MK O’Boyle - Present
   T. Brian Florenzo - Absent
   U. Lam-Phong Pham - Absent
   V. Emily Brobbey - Present (via Zoom)
   W. Sophie Campbell - Present
   X. Skylar Tessler - Absent
   Y. Quana Dennis - Present (via Zoom)
   Z. Matthew Bonner - Present
   AA. Brendan Puglisi - Present

II. PUBLIC COMMENT
   A. None.

III. EXECUTIVE REPORTS
   A. Hamza Aziz, Chair
      1. Preparing for implementation of the Education Course Sanction
         a) Aiming for the week of October 9th
         b) Finalizing logistical details, such as location and scheduling
         c) Training for facilitators
      2. BOV Presentation – 9/15
         a) Updating the Board of Visitors this Friday on multi-sanction and the status of the Honor System.
      3. S&R Timeline
         a) Interviews – Week of 9/18
Internal scheduling will be released by EOD this Wednesday, 9/13.
Training slides will be presented to SOs next Sunday at pool; they will be distributed to representatives via email if unable to attend at 5 p.m.
(a) Alexander Church: Asks if the interviews will be in person or via Zoom.
(b) Hamza Aziz: Interviews will be on Zoom only on Friday and in person for the rest of the week.
b) New SO Welcome Dinner – 9/26, 6 p.m. at Lawn Room 37.
4. Honor Booklet
   a) Reviving the printing of this booklet post-several-year hiatus, being sent to UVAPrint this week.
B. Laura Howard, Vice Chair for Hearings
   1. The first Honor hearing on guilt will be on October 21. Ask the randomly selected representatives to confirm their availability to serve. Preparing for other upcoming Hearings.
C. Nishita Ghanate, Vice Chair for Investigations
   1. 6 active investigations.
D. Carson Breus, Vice Chair for Sanctions
   1. Had a Sanctions Panel last Sunday, actively monitoring the completion of sanctions by 5 students.
E. Rachel Liesegang, Vice Chair for the Undergraduate Community
   1. Asks for representative headshots for the new Honor website.
F. Tyler Sesker, Vice Chair for the Graduate Community
   1. There is a new co-sponsorship form on the website.
G. Lukas Lehman, Vice Chair of the Treasury
   1. None.

IV. SUBCOMMITTEE & WORKING GROUP REPORTS
A. Faculty Advisory Committee
   1. Brianna Kamdoum: Ask representatives to contact the faculty members from their schools on the Faculty Advisory Committee to conduct an event. For most schools, there should be a listserv of all faculty that asks representatives to email faculty with their information and plans for a future event. Asks for people to do something specific with the faculty in their schools and make introductions.
B. Community Relations and Diversity Advisory Committee
   1. Tyler Sesker Asks representatives to let her know if anyone is interested in joining.
C. Policies and Procedures Committee
   1. Tim Dodson: Met for the first time this semester on Friday for goal-setting. They will meet biweekly on Fridays at 3 p.m. They want to explore community service as a sanction. Logistically, questions remain about how community service will be implemented, so P&P members are looking into specific examples of community service, and how other institutions have implemented community service. Also talked about updating the case data portal and exec drop guidance.
a) Brianna Kamdoum: Can we poll the room to see where the Committee stands on Community service?

b) Hamza Aziz: Yes.

c) Brianna Kamdoum: Takes an informal poll on if Committee representatives are in favor of community service. Mentions UVA’s history of enforced labor, and how the Committee should be respectful of it. Wants to see if the Committee is completely on board and comfortable with bringing this as a sanction.

d) MK O’Boyle: Asks if we are conflating community service with community engagement.

e) Brianna Kamdoum: There is nothing that says “community service” in the bylaws, but it falls under the broad category of “community engagement”.

f) Tyler Sesker: Asks if we can focus on the wording, since community engagement is a good thing, but it depends on how we define it. The purpose of the sanction is to have involvement for the duration of the sanction.

g) Brianna Kamdoum: Asks if we should remove community service from the bylaws.

h) Tyler Sesker: We don’t need to use the word “community service”, we can use engagement to show that it’s not a one-time get-out-of-jail-free time, but it’s a long-term commitment.

i) Hamza Aziz: Asks Brianna Kamdoum to repeat the poll question.

j) Brianna Kamdoum: The poll question is if we should have community service as a sanction.

k) Maille Bowerman: Are we using this to refer to working with organizations in the Charlottesville community or at UVA?

l) Rachel Liesegang: Asks if Tyler Sesker is opposed to community service itself or the name.

m) Tyler Sesker: We should pay attention to community service as a word, since it can mean that you are saving some group. We should also pay attention to the history of enslaved labor at UVA. It should be something of substance, not how community service is typically thought of.

n) Maille Bowerman: So, is this exclusively for organizations in Charlottesville?

o) Brianna Kamdoum: I think it would be in the community, but P&P would provide us with those kinds of details.

p) Alexander Church: We should also consider community engagement around Honor. It feels odd to send someone to a community they’re not a part of to help, and there’s the labor aspect as well.

q) Hamza Aziz: P&P also looked at UJC’s conception of community service, which is different from ours. P&P is now looking at the appropriate forms of community service for each offense—lying, cheating, and stealing.

r) Maille Bowerman: Charlottesville organizations may be outside the purview of Honor. Especially for academic violations, it wouldn’t relate to volunteer at the SPCA or a community garden—it feels tangential. It might be better to keep it more germane to UVA. UVA also has a bit of history with
Charlottesville organizations with a turnover of volunteers who leave after 4 years, and some of them don’t necessarily want to engage with UVA students.

s) Brianna Kamdoum: Encourages P&P to explore other forms of community engagement, not community service.

t) Hamza Aziz: Sure. The idea is that P&P members work between members so that we can do that.

V. REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS

A. New School of Data Science representatives introduce themselves.

B. Rachel Liesegang, CLAS: With Hamza Aziz and Laura Howard, met with the College Council this week to figure out how to support each other and potentially help with their “Take Your Professor Out to Lunch” program.

C. MK O’Boyle, LAW: The law school had a really well-attended support officer recruitment session this week.

D. David Armstrong, DARDEN: Darden held a “Norms and Honor Day” last Friday, where a lot of professors provided information about Honor. They got positive feedback about Honor and are excited about the importance that the Office of Students and the faculty put on Honor.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

A. Review Code of Ethics Edits and Approve

1. Hamza Aziz: Mostly formatting, multi-sanction, and case processing updates. The last time that this was updated was in 2019. There is now a general “Honor Educator” section. We now have some common points that extend to all 3 Honor Support Officer pools. Highlights the confidentiality wording—now it says “or receive other benefits” to cover non-monetary forms of benefits and clarifies “outside sources.” We also no longer say that something only applies to specific pools; now, it applies to all Support Officer pools.

2. Brianna Kamdoum: We should evaluate how this will be enforced, because it currently has to be raised by one or more representatives. The new constitution emphasizes accountability, so we should flesh out how it will be enforced that representatives are following the Code of Ethics.

3. Hamza Aziz: It does not say, for example, that the Chair is checking compliance. There is just the expectation that noncompliance can be raised against someone.

4. Lukas Lehman: It makes sense that other people besides the Chair should be able to bring it up; for example, if Nishita Ghanate can’t get people to staff an I Panel, she can bring it up.

5. Brianna Kamdoum: One thing is related to the consistency of these staffing emails. Will a representative be penalized if they don’t respond to an email? Should we be more granular in our language?

6. Tyler Sesker: Will they be penalized for not saying they cannot attend or not staffing at all?
7. Brianna Kamdoum: Not responding will count as a violation of the Code of Ethics. So, there should be some standardization in the staffing emails asking people to respond so they aren’t penalized.

8. Hamza Aziz: We can also add “as needed” since you volunteer for an I-Panel but must go to a Panel for Sanction.

9. Alexander Church: I would like to assume that everyone is working in good faith and good conscience, so I’m not sure if we need to go so specific with the language here.

10. MK O’Boyle: Proposes adding “every reasonable effort” to the beginning of Point 6 to make it softer, and add some room for interpretation.

11. Hamza Aziz: Do we want to add “as needed” to the response portion?

12. Tyler Sesker: It is also appropriate to ask people not to respond if unavailable.

13. Alexander Church: That’s especially true when they need a representative for a specific school.

14. Brianna Kamdoum: We have multiple students on Exec who are in the College of Arts and Sciences. If we have a lot of cases with students from the College, it can place a heavy burden on some representatives. We should look at limiting the burden for a specific few representatives.

15. Hamza Aziz: Asks if we can add something to the Code of Ethics about it.

16. Brianna Kamdoum: It will probably be a bylaw change.

17. Alexander Church: Mentions the impeachment of representatives found guilty of Honor violations. Asks if something similar should be put in for Support Officers.

18. Laura Howard: Makes sense because we also ask people to disclose if they have committed any crimes.

19. Alexander Church: Says it might be a bylaw change.

20. William Hancock: The language in 3.6 should also be “every reasonable effort” and adjust something to “staffing emails” instead of “case staffing emails” to include education events.

21. Hamza Aziz: In favor of making it “staffing emails.” Will continue thinking about Alexander Church’s proposal about Support Officers found guilty of Honor offenses. Asks if we want to add “in person” after “Committee meetings.”

   a) Alexander Church and Brianna Kamdoum support adding “in person.”
   b) Alexander Church: Having people in person is better for communication and conversations.
   c) MK O’Boyle: Is there a way to say something for next summer to ensure we can meet online?
   d) Maille Bowerman: “Every reasonable effort” should encompass that.
   e) Jonathan Swap: Wants to ensure we’re not docking people for this. Accessibility is important, so we want to ensure we’re not harming people by using this online option.
   f) MK O’Boyle: Echoes Jonathan Swap’s point because life experiences and stages are diverse here.
   g) Hamza Aziz: For example, our SCPS reps, once elected, do not live in Charlottesville. Should we take an informal poll on this?
h) Alexander Church: Acknowledges it may be best to leave the language out because of different life stages and living situations.

B. Alexander Church calls the question. Lukas Lehman seconds it. The motion passes.

C. Hamza Aziz: Will loop in Support Officers to see if they have any ideas on the new Code of Ethics.

VII. **NEW BUSINESS**

A. **Generative-AI Discussion**

1. Hamza Aziz: We referenced the Generative AI Task Force’s report at the last meeting; plans for the Committee to discuss more broadly generative AI outside of the case process, and the resources we’re creating and investigating. Recommends looking at page 10 and the “Recommendations” of the Task Force Report. Through a discussion, the Committee can talk about resources, proactive outreach, questions we can asking/answering, and speak to fellow students about their views of AI. Ask representatives to come next week with ideas and opinions to share.

VIII. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

A. None.

The meeting adjourned at 7:54 p.m. The Honor Committee will meet in person in Newcomb Hall on Sunday, September 17th, at 7:00 p.m.