

HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES – DECEMBER 3rd, 2023

I. ROLL CALL (24/29 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 - Absent
- H. William Whitehurst Jr. - **Present (via Zoom)**
- I. Adrian Mamaril - **Present (via Zoom)**
- J. Stephanie McKee - Absent
- K. Brianna Kamdoun - **Present (via Zoom)**
- 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 - **Present (via Zoom)**
- U. Lam-Phong Pham - **Present (via Zoom)**
- V. Emily Brobbey - **Present (via Zoom)**
- W. Sophie Campbell - Absent
- 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 - Absent

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. None.

III. EXECUTIVE REPORTS

- A. Hamza Aziz, Chair
 - 1. Recap of International Students Days
 - a) Hosted four events on Monday and Tuesday, respectively, with Will Hancock and the help of Honor Educators. The IRC events were very successful, especially the IRC focus group and cookie chat. Made some great partnerships, like with the IC and CAELC, that they will continue to foster. Will make a notes document on lessons learned and information gathered that will be shared with Committee.
 - 2. Active Honor Finals Initiative
 - a) Sent out on email Thursday morning to all students plugging the Honor Committee's finals pushes and other resources on Grounds. Asks representatives to plan events for their schools.

- B. Laura Howard, Vice Chair for Hearings
 - 1. Hosting an Appeals Review Panel this evening.
- C. Nishita Ghanate, Vice Chair for Investigations
 - 1. 3 active investigations. Representatives CC'd her on several emails about potential reports, asks people to follow up on those.
- D. Carson Breus, Vice Chair for Sanctions
 - 1. None.
- E. Rachel Liesegang, Vice Chair for the Undergraduate Community
 - 1. Encourages representatives to plan finals pushes events, informs them that Honor Educators can help them staff. Will be having an Honor holiday party this Tuesday to celebrate new trainees and a semester of implementing a multi-sanction system. Asks people to reach out to her for more details.
- F. Tyler Sesker, Vice Chair for the Graduate Community
 - 1. It is taking slightly longer than usual to distribute co-sponsorship checks, since she does not handle this process directly. Will not be approving any new co-sponsorship requests until the beginning of the new year.
 - a) Hamza Aziz: Honor has received a copy of the Honor Constitution translated into Chinese, is working on translating documents into other languages.
 - b) Will Hancock: Asks if people can still submit cosponsorships.
 - c) Tyler Sesker: Yes, she will not just be sending them out.
- G. Lukas Lehman, Vice Chair for the Treasury
 - 1. Asks who has his Honor credit card.
 - a) Brianna Kamdoun: I do.

IV. SUBCOMMITTEE & WORKING GROUP REPORTS

- A. Policies and Procedures Subcommittee
 - 1. Tim Dodson: Will be discussed later this meeting.
- B. Faculty Advisory Subcommittee
 - 1. Brianna Kamdoun: Discussed plans for Honor week and the spring semester. Will be hosting an event on the Thursday of Honor Week to physically walk faculty through the Honor process, accompanied by Honor Advisors. Looking to also do a Rotunda dinner.
- C. Community Relations and Diversity Advisory Subcommittee
 - 1. Tyler Sesker: None.
- D. Survey Working Group
 - 1. Kasra Lekan: Briefly, have worked on the survey. Will be discussed later this meeting.

V. REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS

- A. Tyler Sesker, BATT: Batten is doing exam kits and a breakfast with either Chick Fil-A or Bodos on Tuesday or Wednesday.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

- A. None

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. P&P Interim Report #3 Discussion
 - 1. Hamza Aziz: P&P hosted a meeting this Friday, so people could come with any questions or concerns. There are four sections in the Appendix that could be voted

on. Section 1 discussed arguments and evidence at the Panel for Sanction—P&P said that there could either be no change or language on scope, but did not provide a recommendation. Section 2 discussed the role of the reporter at the Panel for Sanction, and P&P came to the consensus that the reporter should be able to make arguments, but did not say what the arguments should be. It left those decisions up to the reporter and the Counsel for the Community. Section 3 clarified the role of the reporter and the Counsel for the Community, saying that the Counsel for the Community should draw on the perspectives of the reporter and affected parties, not their own personal arguments. These sections were mainly written by Mary Holland Mason and Will Hancock, Senior Counsel and Senior Educator, respectively. Section 4 fills a gap in Exec Drops, so they can be initiated by the Advisor for the Student, as well as the investigators. It was written by Seamus Oliver, Senior Advisor. Section 5 stemmed from the due process presentation to change the language of Pre-Hearing Conferences to be more permissive. There is also a note about who will read Counsel's opening statements at Hearings, but P&P did not reach a recommendation on that. Asks if there are any questions.

Recommends that Committee votes section by section.

- a) Section I: The Scope for the Panel for Sanction
 - (1) Rachel Liesegang moves to adopt the Bylaw change for Section I. Daniel Elliot seconds it.
 - (2) Daniel Elliot: This does not seem to make any meaningful change. It is just clarifying scope language and general principles.
 - (3) Alex Church: The rationale is that having this clarification may be helpful for making future changes.
 - (4) Nishita Ghanate calls the question.
 - (5) The amendment clearly passes.
- b) Section II: Role of the Reporter and the Counsel for the Community at the Panel for Sanction
 - (1) Nishita Ghanate motions to adopt the Bylaw change. Alex Church seconds it.
 - (2) Alex Church calls the question.
 - (3) The amendment clearly passes.
- c) Section III: Exec Drops
 - (1) Daniel Elliot: Asks if it should be either advisor.
 - (2) Nishita Ghanate: Currently, I bring it to Exec in real practice, whenever any party claims that there may be grounds for an Exec drop, so this is just codifying what we do.
 - (3) Daniel Elliot: It makes sense to me for it to be either investigator or advisor, so any of the four people can bring it up, and Exec must consider it.
 - (4) Nishita Ghanate: That makes sense to me. We do this already in practice.
 - (5) Daniel Elliot motions for it to be "either Honor investigator or either Honor advisor requests...". The motion to amend the amendment passes.
 - (6) Committee votes on the amendment.
 - (7) The amendment clearly passes.
- d) Section IV: Pre-Hearing Conference and Hearing Procedures
 - (1) Daniel Elliot: Asks to vote on all six at once.
 - (2) Alex Church: Motions to divide them.

- (3) Kasra Lekan: Asks for the exact changes.
- (4) Daniel Elliot: It is adding “can” and replacing “second” with “third”.
- (5) Kasra Lekan: Does not understand the shift between shall and can and the philosophical change.
- (6) Laura Howard: Clarifies that the Pre-Hearing Conference is not a large due process concern. But, mentions that this is taking off some of the control of the Pre-Hearing Conference. The PHC currently has the potential to play a very large role in determining what will happen at the Hearing, so recommend bolstering our commitment to due process by taking away the potential for the PHC to make these decisions if they choose to defer to the Hearing Panel.
- (7) Daniel Elliot: Thinks of this as training wheels, as moving toward a Pre-Hearing Conference that makes fewer decisions without the student’s input.
- (8) Alex Church: Asks what happens if the PHC does not determine the list of witnesses.
- (9) Daniel Elliot: Counsel would bring it up in a hearing, at the typical due process format.
- (10) Evan Pivonka: Asks Daniel Elliot to clarify if witnesses and evidence are not excluded in trials.
- (11) Daniel Elliot: It’s not that, but it does happen in a meaningfully different way than it happens in our system. It is more of a written form in a hearing system, which is not like our PHC. Our PHC tells our student counsel what they are and are not allowed to say at hearings, which jeopardizes students’ rights to due process, in my opinion.
- (12) Evan Pivonka: Confirms that Daniel Elliot is not offering legal advice. How would a witness be able to rebut something at the Hearing, since they would not be there?
- (13) Daniel Elliot: Yes, they would go get them. Counsel for the Accused would then go find the witness that could help the student.
- (14) Evan Pivonka: It is my understanding that this can happen now.
- (15) Laura Howard: The Pre-Hearing Conference is not currently the final word on any of these matters. If something arises at the Hearing, we can, and have, had the ability to reaffirm the student’s continuing right to due process.
- (16) Daniel Elliot: Currently, student counsel are not aware of all of their options, which is why our due process system is not currently where it needs to be.
- (17) Evan Pivonka: Feels that it is necessary to put on the record that Honor’s due process policies and procedures have gone through University Counsel for years. Respects Daniel Elliot’s opinion, but says it is aggressive to suggest that we have been violating students’ rights to due process.
- (18) Brianna Kamdoun: Asks if it is necessary to delineate in our Bylaws that counsel can change in our Bylaws.

(19) Laura Howard: We can include it in the Handbook and at a training for counsel.

(20) Daniel Elliot: We can also make our handbook more detailed.

(21) This section of Bylaws clearly passes.

e) Points about the reading of opening statements at Hearings

(1) Hamza Aziz: Currently, the Vice Chair for Hearings reads aloud the facts, and each counsel's opening statements. This change is for the VCH to read aloud the facts, and Counsel will read aloud their own opening statements.

(2) Jonathan Swap: Clarifies that panelists already read or hear the opening statements before the hearing.

(3) Rachel Liesegang: This is just a determination of who reads aloud them during the hearing, not before.

(4) Laura Howard: Clarifies the order of reading aloud the opening statements. It will only be read aloud once, by the counsel, at the beginning of the hearing.

(5) Will Hancock: Believes that there's value in having it read aloud by someone impartial. Think that having any emotion in it would be bad.

(6) Laura Howard: Respectfully disagrees with Will Hancock. There is no emotion, but there is argument within them, so even if the Hearing Chair is impartial, there is still an argument. The Hearing Chair will still be reading aloud the facts of the case.

(7) Rachel Liesegang: It also upholds the spirit and appearance of the Hearing Chair as an impartial body.

(8) Kasra Lekan: Clarifies the language of the third Bylaw suggestion. Asks to clarify the two sides.

(9) Hamza Aziz: It was if opening statements should be read aloud by an objective party, the Hearing Chair, or if it should be read aloud by counsel.

(10) Jonathan Swap: Asks if with this change, panelists will still receive these before to read.

(11) Hamza Aziz: Yes. Requests vote.

(12) The amendment clearly passes.

2. Hamza Aziz will also make a housekeeping amendment after discussing it with Exec about changing one reference "Appeals Review Committee" to "Appeals Review Panel" that should have previously been changed. Providing Committee the required 24-hour notice.

B. Review Survey Question Draft

1. Kasra Lekan: Articulated a desire to survey the broader University community to see what they think about questions that are relevant to this Committee. My vision is that this can be improved over time and be used to gather longitudinal data about how the Committee views Honor. We're still internally discussing how to balance the survey.
2. Rachel Liesegang: Likes the idea of question 1.6, but recommends changing the third option from the IR to something about it staying at expulsion. It almost feels like a tricky test question.
3. Kasta Lekan: This is a "screener question", to see the level of knowledge the person who is filling out the survey has about the past year.

4. Daniel Elliot: We can get a lot of great data just based off of that question. The survey is really excellently done. We should just broadly make the TA questions the same as the faculty questions, with some tweaks, to get meaningful data about the TA perspective.
5. Hamza Aziz: Does not want it to be too lengthy. Recommends asking what kind of event people are most likely to attend, to gauge the kind of events we put on next semester and next Committee puts on next year.
6. Jonathan Swap: Asks about incentives for people to fill out the survey, across far-reaching experiences in the University Community.
7. Kasra Lekan: We haven't talked about it internally yet.
8. Hamza Aziz: We have a lot of different options.
9. Brianna Kamdoun: This was really well-crafted. Recommends asking if they participated in the recent election that led to Constitutional reforms, and if the Honor Committee met the goals that they had anticipated.
10. Hamza Aziz: We have about a week until it needs to be completely finalized.
11. Kasra Lekan: We will take in your comments and make some other changes, then will send out a draft that you all can take to test it out.
12. Hamza Aziz: Will send out an email with the survey, case statistics, and summaries, around December 18.
13. Alex Church: Asks if we should not include it in the larger email, and instead take a random sample.
14. Hamza Aziz: Will look into it.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. Will Hancock: Requests that when Committee votes, they record who votes in favor, who votes against, and who abstains.

The meeting adjourned at 7:56 p.m. The Honor Committee will meet in person in Newcomb Hall on Sunday, January 21, at 7:00 p.m.