

HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES – OCTOBER 6, 2024

I. ROLL CALL (21/29 PRESENT)

Seamus Oliver	P
Alex Church	P
Carson Breus	P
Thomas Ackleson	P
Ian Novak	P
Will Hancock	P
Laura Howard	P
Alicia Phan	
McKenzie Jones	
Suleiman Abdulkadir	P
Michael Sirh	
Sheryl Loden	P
Simran Havaladar	P
Andrew Cornfeld	P
Rachel Fellman	
Loi Dawkins	
Brittany Toth	P
Meredith DeLong-Maxey	P
Clare Striegel	
Cassidy Dufour	P
Ayda Mengistie	P
Mary Holland Mason	P
Margaret Zirwas	P
Hannah Lipinski	P
Penelope Molitz	P
Nile Liu	P
Lam-Phong Pham	P
Ben Makarechian	P
Vivian Mok	

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. None.

III. EXECUTIVE REPORTS

A. Laura Howard, Chair

1. New SO dinner on Monday, training classes started this week, YAR Brunch
2. Meeting at Alumni Hall about AI, joined HAHC

3. Admin meeting, COMM Admin meeting
4. FAC and D&R Case Study catch up
- B. Seamus Oliver, Vice Chair for Investigations
 1. There are four cases under investigations. One student began the CR process.
 2. I sat in on one of the new Advisor trainings.
- C. Alex Church, Vice Chair for Hearings
 1. We have no cases in the Hearing process.
 2. New SO training has gone great.
- D. Carson Breus, Vice Chair for Sanctions
 1. No updates.
- E. Will Hancock, Vice Chair for the Undergraduate Community
 1. I talked with TAs in a grad student class. Had our first Community in dinner which was very successful.
 2. First Educator Pool today.
- F. Ian Novak, Vice Chair for the Graduate Community
 1. We want to standardize some of the training graduate students receive.
 2. Will and I attending the graduate resource fair.
- G. Thomas Ackleson, Vice Chair for Operations
 1. YAR Brunch, more co-sponsorships. Please email your school councils.

IV. Representative Reports

- A. Caddisy: Ayda and I met with our school-specific Educators.
- B. Carson: Simran and I gave a presentation to our faculty senate.

V. SUBCOMMITTEE & WORKING GROUP REPORTS

- A. Policies and Procedures Committee
 1. Mary Holland: Met on Friday and potential new By-law tonight.
- B. Faculty Advisory Committee
 1. Simran: Upcoming meeting with Dean Jenkins.
- C. Community Relations and Diversity Advisory Committee
 1. Ben: CRDAC application closes today. We have a number of applications. We had our first meeting today and have begun planning our correspondence. I had a great meeting with the President of the Student Advisory Committee. He sent the CRDAC application to the student athlete advisory committee.
- D. Data and Research Committee
 1. Max: Case study working group met today. We are hoping for results to be out to the Committee by early next semester.
- E. Ad-hoc Subcommittee on Sanctions
 1. Will: Cassidy and Jack will present on our plan later today that I've been alluding to over the past few weeks.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Discuss (and potentially vote on) a bylaw regarding our Standards Panel procedure
 1. Mary Holland: In our current bylaws, the Chair of the Standards Panel is a voting member and the individual running the proceeding. This is unlike our PG and PS.

This would bring the Standards Panel process to be more aligned with the rest of our processes. Explains the details of the By Law.

2. Will: Right now can the Chair not refer?
 3. Mary Holland: To get to a Standards Panel, a complaint is filed with the Honor Chair and then refers the claim. This proposal would change that.
 4. Seamus: Proposal currently says that Chair randomly selects four members. Do you envision the other person being randomly selected before?
 5. Mary Holland: All five of them would be randomly selected at the same time (typo clarification).
 6. Seamus: Can we get rid of the “including the Chair if applicable” bit?
 7. Mary Holland: Yes.
 8. Seamus: Can we say six members (including a non-voting Chair)?
 9. Mary Holland: Yes.
 10. Laura: Reads the fully edited bylaw.
 11. Will: Why have the six members like that when I believe that for a PS we refer to a five-member panel? I think we should mirror that language where possible.
 12. Alex: We just need a solution to “what happens if the Chair recuses?”
 13. Mary Holland: We didn’t account for that. I assume we can add this: “an appointed or elected Member of the Executive Committee?”
 14. Laura: Does anyone else have anything to add to this? Reads the updated bylaw. Are people ready to vote?
 15. Alex: I think it would be helpful to have language in the future.
 16. Seamus: I’m ready to vote now (Margaret sends updated bylaw in the Zoom chat).
 17. Laura: Reads the fully updated Bylaw.
 18. Cassidy: Should there be a recusal process for someone who isn’t the Chair? Is this the standard recusal process.
 19. Alex: It’s the same process.
 20. Laura: Is there any opposition to vote on this right now.
 21. Voting occurs. The bylaw passes.
- B. Guest speaker nomination form
1. Moved to a future meeting.
- C. Discuss the Graduate Student Subcommittee
1. Moved to a future meeting.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Discuss a set of bylaws regarding the role of the Counsel for the Community at the Panel for Sanction
1. Will: Introduces the new proposal from the SWG. This change will have the CC represent the Community more wholly. I’ll pass it on to Cassidy and Jack.
 2. Cassidy and Jack: Conduct a presentation on the proposal.
 3. Will: As we jump into questions – people in SWG feel free to jump in – SOs should feel free to jump in.
 4. Seamus: I have a lot of concerns, both in the way that this feels like a vote of no confidence of the current I/C pool, and also in that this expands the timeline to at least 14 days. The last thing I’d want to do as a Guilty Student is have that hanging

over my head. I'm concerned students may waive their rights and do the PS ASAP. Is there a reason the CC can't meet your expanded notice idea by just submitting the statement they plan on reading? Do we need all of these forms? The arguments explain themselves.

5. Cassidy: I have concerns about the reporter making an impact statement before a guilty verdict. There are many mitigating circumstances the CC will need time to prep for, the student needs time to understand and make arguments, etc. The issue we've had at SWG is that it could probably be done in 10 days. We do Hearings on weekends, and that would put the PS in the middle of the week.
6. Mary Holland: Does the student notice have to go to opposing CC? Are they under obligation to share that with opposing counsel?
7. Cassidy: Students have no obligations to disclose information. They can still bring it up before panelists, and it just wouldn't be something CC could include in their arguments.
8. Mary Holland: If the student doesn't provide a mitigating circumstance but one comes up at the panel
9. Jack: The student can say whatever they want at the panel. This is intended for the CC. This is meant to inform the student and CC as much as possible.
10. Seamus: In the bylaws sent out, we have the reporter reading the impact statement at the panel. Why?
11. Will: We thought it was important for there to be time at the PS for them to hear the statement. We decided it shouldn't be the VCS. We also thought the AS could read it, but that would be the only time an Advisor would present at a Hearing. They can't stray from the impact statement. It would be their opportunity to say their thoughts. There wouldn't be any questions read it. But that would be the only time an Advisor would present at a Hearing. They can't stray from the impact statement. It would be their opportunity to say their thoughts. There wouldn't be any questions.
12. Seamus: What value is added by anyone reading it out loud?
13. Will: We talk about this all the time with document overload. It's the same logic. It's how you weigh things. Having a time for that to be read is a time for that perspective to be heard. Giving time for this third important perspective to be heard. I think this is relatively small in the grand scheme of things.
14. Seamus: Why have the suspension vote and in the event the student is suspended require them to come back in for arguments about general sanctions. Put yourself in the shoes of the student, the last thing on my mind after getting suspended is arguing for ten more minutes to get a less severe sanction.
15. Will: The current language in the temporary removal section is that if the student is sanctioned to it, the Panel may determine to add additional sanctions as they deem appropriate for their return to the University. There is no third vote.
16. Cassidy: The issue is that students don't touch on general sanctions at all. I do think there's an issue if you're going to just argue for suspension.
17. Will: I think the way we might solve that, I agree that part of that ten minutes would be devoted to talking affirmatively about what they would do in general sanctions.
18. Cassidy: That kind of negates the need or the general sanctions argument.

19. Will: That is just basically saying the restoration of the temporary removal, it's like packaging the sanctions with temporary removal.
20. Cassidy: I'm fine packaging sanctions, it would just need to be clear that the Panel is doing it, and that the temporary removal would be thing being argued about, not the package of other sanctions.
21. Carson: Panelists are thinking about general sanctions regardless when considering suspension. I think it is better if you package it in one voting round.
22. Alex: In the proposal you had different categories based on severity. Is there any explicit categorization for CC to look at other than severity?
23. Jack: Not currently.
24. Alex: Because of how different the severity is between suspension and everything else, how useful is this framework when talking about sanctions other than suspension? I don't necessarily think there's a huge severity difference between some of our "lighter" sanctions.
25. Jack: One of the reasons of SWG is to come up with new sanctions.
26. Cassidy: The idea here is that if we go back to the purposes of sanctioning, if you look at severity, it's how accountable you need to hold the student. The aggravating and mitigating circumstances speak to the severity. They don't really change the accountability. This would be covered in training: you look at accountability level, how it changes the restoration level, if you commit a severe sanction, you might need more support.
27. Laura: Ends discussion for time. We will continue this discussion in the future (next week). We are not meeting next week for Fall Reading Days. I encourage everyone to go to the SWG office hours.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. None.

The Committee adjourned at 7:58 PM and will meet again in two weeks.