

HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES – NOVEMBER 17, 2024

I. ROLL CALL (21/30 Present)

Seamus Oliver	P
Alex Church	P
Carson Breus	P
Thomas Ackleson	P
Ian Novak	A
Will Hancock	P
Laura Howard	P
Alicia Phan	A
McKenzie Jones	A
Suleiman Abdulkadir	P
Michael Sirh	A
Sheryl Loden	P
Simran Havaladar	P
Andrew Cornfeld	P
Rachel Fellman	P
Loi Dawkins	A
Brittany Toth	P
Meredith DeLong-Maxey	A
Clare Striegel	A
Cassidy Dufour	A
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	A
Bijoy Ghosh	P

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. None.

III. EXECUTIVE REPORTS

A. Laura Howard, Chair

1. Worked with Trustees and L2K on Nov 13 memorial.
2. Met with Air Force person about survey at UVA.
3. Working with graphic designer, student affairs marketing cloud.
4. Coffee with Bijoy.
5. Met with Alex Hall at CASS about resources for SOs, Reps, and students in our case process.

6. CLAS educators.
 7. Working with Bee about a sticker design for LOTL.
 8. Interviewed by Cecilia, a Cav Daily reporter, for an article about AI policies at UVA.
 9. VPSA meetings and interviews.
- B. Seamus Oliver, VCI
1. There are six active investigations.
- C. Alex Church, VCH
1. Two cases proceeding to Hearing.
 2. Tuesday and Wednesday Mock Hearings for the training classes.
- D. Carson Breus, VCS
1. PS for three cases tonight.
- E. Will Hancock, VCUC
1. If you're not at the Mock Hearing, ISD are Tuesday and Wednesday. Four big events. Dinner on Tuesday at 6:30 (the roundtable). If you know people in your school who would like to attend, please let me know. It would be great for Honor reps to show up.
 2. Finals pushes. Many people have contributed to the spreadsheet; please continue doing this.
 3. Me, Ian, and Laura talked to a COLA class.
 4. I'll be hosting a tailgate outside the AFC for Honor reps to join.
- F. Ian Novak, VCGC
1. No updates.
- G. Thomer Ackleson, VCO
1. Flurry of co-spos is winding down.
 2. Planning a rework of the Co-Sponsorship Guidelines --> contract.
 3. Helped interview new PACE Director candidates over the weekend with Laura, IFC, ISC, and UJC.

IV. **SUBCOMMITTEE & WORKING GROUP REPORTS**

- A. Policies and Procedures Committee
1. Mary Holland: We finalized the sanctioning precedent reference document we'll talk about later. Discussed an incoming proposal on changing investigations and moving to hearings.
- B. Faculty Advisory Committee
1. Simran: No major updates. We're meeting in the next few weeks to continue department outreach, and plan a case walkthrough during Honor week.
- C. Community Relations and Diversity Advisory Committee
1. Ben: We had our first full meeting with our new member last Friday. We did introductions, got everyone introduced to each other, and went over our broad goals. Did an overview of where we want to go over the remainder of the term. We will meet as a full subcommittee once more before the end of the semester.
- D. Data and Research Committee

1. Max: We met today to finalize the case study which will be sent out soon. We also contacted a PhD student from Missouri to help with a parallel study. Big thanks to Alex for helping with Hearing recordings for the case study.

E. Ad-hoc Subcommittee on Sanctions

1. Will: We will discuss later, but talked about the role of the reporter. Also discussing our sanctioning pillars.

F. Graduate Student Affairs

1. No updates.

V. **REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS**

- A. Laura: Met with Rayyan, the CLAS Educator, and we decided on finals pushes. We'll have one that's slime themed, and one with candy goodie bags.
- B. Alex: We met about an hour ago to do the Celsius handouts and looking for creative ways to advertise that.
- C. Ayda: ISD this week. The schedule is on our website, and we'd love to have you all. I will be on the international student panel. We'll have panelists from various schools to talk about resources that are available to them. Please email me or talk to me after committee to discuss later.

VI. **GUEST SPEAKER**

- A. LOTL Co-Sponsorship.

VII. **OLD BUSINESS**

- A. None.

VIII. **NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Discuss the P&P "Sanctioning Precedent Reference" document.
 1. Margaret: We've been working with Carson to put it together. It's a sanctioning precedent document that would be given to panelists during sanctioning. All of the information in it is publicly available and not confidential. It's organized by the nature of the offense. There's a summary of what sanctions were given for which offenses.
 2. Mary Holland: This is not a binding precedent or a bylaw. It's just a way to formalize questions about "what has been done in the past?" It's just a way to provide more context when deciding to sanction. This also helps keep Carson's institutional memory around.
 3. Penelope: How frequently will this be updated?
 4. Margaret: At the end of each semester when public summaries are released.
 5. Laura: Thanks guys. In terms of implementation, we'll have this printed and handed out.

- B. Discuss if the reporter should be able to answer questions at a Panel for Sanction following a Guilty verdict.
1. Laura: This was something that came up at the 10/20 meeting. It was included in that proposal but it seemed like we wanted more discussion. Cassidy isn't here, but sent me a statement to read.
 2. Cassidy: "The reporting questioning bylaws is just preventing panelists from asking irrelevant questions (relevance is defined in the bylaws). There's no other part of the bylaws that prevents panelists from considering irrelevant information but if it's irrelevant it doesn't serve any utility, wastes time and distracts panelists from the important and relevant information. If people are concerned about the appearance of making the reporter feel limited in what they can say, I would suggest a bylaw that only allows Panelists to consider relevant information in sanctioning generally so the reporter doesn't feel singled out" (via a message she sent before Committee)
 3. Will: One additional piece of context, if we do want to ask the reporter questions we'll need to change something in the bylaws. Here's language that follows that: "the panelists will be provided the opportunity to ask relevant questions." The main sticking point is the word "relevant." There are three options: they have to be relevant for just the reporter, they have to only ask relevant questions to everyone, or leave out the word "relevant."
 4. Margaret: What is the language about relevance at a Hearing?
 5. Thomas: Who judges on the relevance?
 6. Carson: It's only the VCS.
 7. Alex: I don't think the Reporter will feel singled out since they won't be there the whole time. Also, would CC and CA be able to object to questions?
 8. Seamus: I'm fine with throwing in the relevant other bylaws. My question is more, if we're doing questions for the reporter, is right before arguments? Or incorporated into the deliberation structure?
 9. Will: We're not set on that, but it would just be Carson but I don't know why Counsel wouldn't be able to object. There's no solid answer. To the other question, the Reporter is asked all questions at once. Because right now in the bylaws the impact statement is read before everything else. The idea is the questions would come at the same time. We didn't consider asking them back multiple times, but that could be a good thing.
 10. Laura: Do people feel like the Reporter should be called back repeatedly to answer questions?
 11. Seamus: The only trouble here is they'd only be called back if the panel has an important question. Does the student have the right to speak last at a PS?
 12. Will: It's not in the Constitution.
 13. Carson: Nobody else speaks at the PS.

14. Laura: Should they be able to be called back throughout the whole process? Is there a certain point where people think it should be cutoff?
15. Will: I think there would be three mini rounds or something like that where the student testifies last at each. If something in their statement makes it sound like one sanction in another round might work
16. Seamus: For that question (suspension vs. Everything else) would ideally be raised in the first round. The panel should know the reporter's thoughts on all categories before voting, especially on suspension.
17. Will: Agreed. I don't know if we build in a structured questioning period in each one. But we should still have some flexibility to call people back.
18. Seamus: If we're going to do that, what should AC be telling reporters at the PS about potentially staying around? Or should be have them available over Zoom or the phone? I want a standard thing for AS to tell the reporter.
19. Will: The burden of a lot of this is on the reporter. They don't have to answer more questions or be called back. It's perfectly fine if they don't want to show up or write a statement. AS should clarify that the reporter can't answer more questions if they leave. I don't see it being a huge problem in the way it could be for a Hearing.
20. Laura: We could also just borrow the model from the Hearing where they're here for the first time, and then ideally free over the phone for the rest of the night if needed.
21. Mary Holland: On objections, I think it should just be Carson. If C can object to the panel, they should be able to object to a student. Which I'm not OK with.
22. Margaret: Going back to the word "relevant." To me, it's better if we have another statement that clarifies questions that wouldn't be considered relevant.
23. Will: Part of the idea is that it's almost on the reporter. If they start asking speculative questions, Carson should have a well-curated list. But I think that makes sense. It's important to keep in mind we're just talking about objecting to panelist questions. I would be uncomfortable with other objections like the VCS objecting to the reporter or something. It's just the questions the panelists can ask.
24. Mary Holland: I do like the idea of "they can't ask X" versus "you can only ask this."
25. Seamus: Members of the PS should only consider relevant evidence.
26. Will: I think that's now possible with CC. Having the I Log and other things that were presented. I think that philosophy could work well.
27. Ben: To clarify, broader relevance is "you can't ask X" versus "you can only ask this."

28. Laura: We're either going to say the reporter can only talk about relevant things, or the PS will only consider relevant stuff.
29. Will: I'm not sure I'd be in favor of going from the student having ten minutes to talk about whatever they like and going to telling them what not to talk about. If no irrelevant info can be at the PS, then panelists shouldn't.
30. Laura: This all only applies to the questions panelists are allowed to ask.
31. Seamus: My point there, and my read on Cassidy's statement, is that in general we don't want panelists getting caught up in irrelevant evidence stuff. We can't tell people not to include something. It should be on the backend and built in to filter out irrelevant stuff.
32. Mary Holland: I think that totally makes sense.
33. Carson: I'm a fan of it being the exact same way we treat relevance for students during deliberations. We should trust the VCS and VCH to have that kind of authority.
34. Will: Nobody on SWG thought about only letting us present relevant evidence. I want to make it clear that's not something we were considering. This is more about preventing rabbit holes for panelists.
35. Laura: There are two options: send it back to SWG, or saying we're satisfied with the backend plan where the VCS filters things out. Or it could be guardrails on what the panelists should ask.
36. Seamus: I think both works fine and are not mutually exclusive. I think we could just do both.
37. Laura: Ok, so we will put that out on the 12/01 voting day.

C. Discuss solutions for efficiency and reporter buy-in.

1. Laura: There have been challenges to Honor for a long time pre-MS about efficiency. MS solved a lot of these problems, but they're still some of our biggest challenges. I want to open the floor to more conversation about this one.
2. Will: I think one thing that we have to keep in mind is who we're here representing. Anything we're doing in terms of efficiency shouldn't come as a tradeoff for the rights or privileges of the student. We should keep that on the forefront of what we're doing. But I'm all for efficiency if it doesn't compromise their rights.
3. Laura: And to clarify, efficiency is also important to students anecdotally.
4. Will: I think students will always take more rights/privileges if it means waiting a longer time.
5. Alex: At P&P, we talked about some drastic ways to speed up case processing times. We talked about the benefits and drawbacks of each. There were a couple things we teased out of it. That proposal was to cut the I Panel, but there are issues about the formal accusation. That was what Will was alluding to. Efficiency will always come at some cost, and a lot of our

case processing takes longer than it probably needs to. At least on my end, students try to make things longer typically. That's not great for administrative purposes or reporters.

6. Seamus: As part of the group that pitched the initial idea, I'm of the opinion that the system can be organized to go faster without major losses in rights and privileges. If you have ideas, bring them to exec. We have ideas of our own that we'll bring to you all.
7. Ben: I have a question about removing the I Panel. What portion of I Panel cases are dropped?
8. Seamus: Excluding the IR, it's probably around a 1/4, which is under five cases per term.
9. Will: With a lot of these efficiency things, bringing them to Mary Holland Margaret is good for getting SO perspectives. It's a good process to get more people involved. Drafting bylaws also helps.
10. Seamus: Ben, there have been 5 drops since 2021. Other cases are considered by exec drops, motion to dismiss, etc. Which is why that number is so small.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. None.

The Committee adjourned at 7:55 PM. The Committee will not meet next week (Thanksgiving). December 1st is a voting day meeting, which is mandatory. It's the last one of the semester.