

HONOR COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES – OCTOBER 20, 2024

I. ROLL CALL (21/29 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	P
Suleiman Abdulkadir	A
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	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	A

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. None.

III. EXECUTIVE REPORTS

A. Laura Howard, Chair

1. P&P, FAC, D&R case study catch-ups
2. Met with Marsh; met with the Interim Associate Director of Accountability for PACE
3. Listening session with the Search Committee for Dean of Students
4. Met with Professor Zoe Robertson, who is advising the D&R case study
5. Emailed about newsletter set up

- B. Seamus Oliver, Vice Chair for Investigations
 - 1. There are six active investigations.
 - 2. A few more students had the courage to take the CR.
- C. Alex Church, Vice Chair for Hearings
 - 1. No Hearings are currently scheduled.
 - 2. We will have an Appeal Hearing next Sunday.
 - 3. Met with UJC VCS Ally McVey and Ben Ulchi for PACE.
- D. Carson Breus, Vice Chair for Sanctions
 - 1. None.
- E. Will Hancock, Vice Chair for the Undergraduate Community
 - 1. ISD: getting some balls rolling, 11/19-11/20. Cool partnerships with VISAs and coordinating meetings with international students program. Coordinating a dinner and feedback.
 - 2. Honor Week: Me and Laura are meeting with people at the Alumni Association.
- F. Ian Novak, Vice Chair for the Graduate Community
 - 1. Not present.
- G. Thomas Ackleson, Vice Chair for Operations
 - 1. More cosponsorships, pitch to school councils, happened for the engineering school.

IV. **SUBCOMMITTEE & WORKING GROUP REPORTS**

- A. Policies and Procedures Committee
 - 1. Margaret: Met to discuss ideas for improving SO training, increasing Reporter buy in, finalizing proposals for the coming weeks.
- B. Faculty Advisory Committee
 - 1. Simran: We have our first Dean pavilion lunch on the 23rd. Good opportunity to interact with COMM faculty. A signup spreadsheet will be available.
- C. Community Relations and Diversity Advisory Committee
 - 1. Ben: We met and discussed what may have gone wrong with our outreach. We have implemented a new plan with a later deadline, and have a substantially larger applicant pool now.
- D. Data and Research Committee
 - 1. Max: We met earlier today regarding the case study, will be finishing up the notes. Met with our faculty advisor recently. Regarding the P&P collaboration: we have sent our questions, and expect results next semester. That's in the official post-Hearing survey now.
- E. Ad-hoc Subcommittee on Sanctions
 - 1. Will: We are voting tonight, we made some updates, we have been receiving feedback over the last two weeks. We will have a larger discussion of those bylaws tonight.

V. **REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS**

- A. Nile: The Med school is cosponsoring a coffee talk on 11/05, can talk to Med students about Honor.
- B. Thomas: I will send the event details/flyer later.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

A. Continue discussion of the proposal by the Sanctions Working Group about the role of the Counsel for the Community at the Panel for Sanction

1. Will: I'm going to walk through in basic terms what this is. Carson sent a statement which will be read. We will breakdown and discuss three components. Right now, after Hearing for guilt the PS happens as soon as the student is ready to schedule it. I believe it has to happen within a week. The CC draws solely on the perspective of the reporter. The two things this would change are separating out the CC arguments on behalf of the community. The reporter can turn in a reporter impact statement. There are not three sides being argued. And with communication: currently, the student doesn't get notice about what the reporter wants sanctions to be. They come in not knowing that, so this change sets up communication for the parties to exchange information. The CC tell the student in advance of the PS what sanctions they are proposing. References an example in the one pager. One thing about the mitigating factors, the CC can but don't have to use that information. That happens in the first two days (they are submitted to CC). Within next two days, CC, based on that context and severity, comes together with the sanctions they are proposing and why (severity, circumstances). From there, it's whenever they can schedule it. They would have until Sunday (in the example), giving the student up to four days to prepare their statement for the PS given the notice before. One last thing this does, it breaks out deliberations differently. Now in the proposal there are two rounds of deliberation: one for just expulsion, and then for all other sanctions. There are three tiers: expulsion, temporary removal, and general sanctions.
2. Laura: Reads Carson's statement (Carson is absent). Before we go back to Will, are there any questions?
3. Will: There are three things in the chat we're going to discuss. These are the biggest sticking points and things I thought would be the most important to discuss. I will note also that the reporter reading the reporter impact statement. We will vote on this general by law now, and then vote on that line later. We will discuss that after voting on the rest of it. I wanted to start on the timeline.
4. Ben: I have a few questions about the CC role. Given Carson's statement, are we not discussing the details there? Are we saving that for later?
5. Will: We should talk about that now. When we go to vote, we should remember that that could be changed after the fact.
6. Ben: I feel like because the CC can propose their sanction before the panel can deliberate, they anchor the conversation that I think gives them disproportioned power. Having one person represent the whole community is a big deal. I wonder what the training would look like for that?
7. Will: Part of it is that the student still gets to speak before deliberations, so the panel still hears all sides. CC gets less time, and the Reporter can't answer questions. I'm not sure if anyone else has ideas for training?
8. Ben: To clarify, the CC gives their arguments first? (Will: yes).
9. Ben: Have you considered changing that?
10. Will: It's so that if the CC says something outlandish, the student still speaks last.

11. Seamus: At the very least, when I was writing the initial framework, I made the CC 5 minute and Student 10 minute decision. It's worthwhile to discuss that. If there's anything people want to say on that point.
12. Cassidy: The thought behind CC going first is because the student should always go last, and their interests need to be weighed. Even though it anchors the initial part of the argument is the CC, and what will be fresher in the panel's minds would be the student. The reason for the timing is that CA has the opportunity to talk about the standards that the panel must meet. If you consider that, there is equal time for both sets of counsel and the student and the community.
13. Seamus: Is there a burden of proof for sanctioning? I'm not aware that's a framework we operate under.
14. Will: If you read the bylaws, the first question for the panel is (...). At least in my reading of it, that seems to say that they need to think they need a leave of absence.
15. Alex: Does the burden of proving that then falls on the student and not the community?
16. Will: I'm looking now. I'm not sure. Versus how we do it in a Hearing, this is a different thing in the sense that this isn't putting it on one side. We could add a negative in the by law and reverse that. But because PS is not fact finding, I feel comfortable with the language as is but I'm not sure how people feel.
17. Will: We can revisit that. And I want to check in on the timeline. I'm not sure we got there. We actually did. This was moved from a 14 day period to and 10 day period.
18. Thomas: Asks about the logistics of scheduling... what happens when that falls apart for some unforeseen scheduling reason?
19. Will: It's the CCs job as SOs, and the reporter's job to fill out the statement. In the first part. I'm not sure if anyone else has thoughts.
20. Kessler (audience): In staffing cases with reporters, I've very rarely had reporters submit statements or documents that quickly. A lot of reporters feel they don't have a role.
21. Seamus: In the event this passes, training Advisors to have the reporter sit down and write or start the document. At least where I stand, it's worse to give them the extra 72 hours than give the reporter extra time.
22. Will: A lot of what's in the reporter statement is how they were affected, so that doesn't change much. So they don't necessarily have to start writing it after the Hearing. They could draft one long before a Hearing.
23. Mary Holland: I take an issue with SOs telling reporters to start recommending sanctions before guilt. I think there's concern about that, I'd feel weird as an Advisor recommend that.
24. Kessler: I think it leaves the impression that a guilty verdict is inbound.
25. Laura: It seems like where we are now, people are uncomfortable with the reporter drafting the statement before a guilty verdict. And also the 48 hours not being enough time for them. How are people feeling about this?
26. Ben: I agree with the sentiment that it could be misleading and it a little strange. I do think that if Advisors were trained to tell them to start thinking about it before

hand. I don't know how detailed we envision the statement being. But it could be reasonable to have some progress done.

27. Rachel: Will the guilty verdict be given during a weekend or Friday? I don't think we can expect Professors to work over the weekend.
28. Alex: To add context, all Hearings are on Friday or the weekends. So all PS would be over a weekend.
29. Margaret: What about having the Reporter write their statement long before the Hearing? I wouldn't see it change during the Hearing.
30. Thomas: The Hearing really does elucidate all the details of the case.
31. Alex: The main reason the Hearing has representatives is that those people will hear the things in the Hearing. So I think having all of those details at the very end would be better.
32. Margaret: That's true. The reporter does know the evidence beforehand.
33. Seamus: There are two times that spring out for me: the Community Response Interview during the investigation (pre I Panel). But I wouldn't want a form to ask what sanctions they're looking for. The other is right when the reporter is filed, which is when the reporter is angriest and most willing to work with Honor. I'm not comfortable asking a reporter to recommend sanctions. If their statement is only about what sanctions they want, I only like that after the guilty verdict.
34. Kessler: That early, Reporters don't know much about the sanctions typically. I also think that student reporters have a considerable time burden (TAs, other students, etc.) The burden is on them but we have to give them time too.
35. Mary Holland: Seconding Seamus' idea, maybe it's worth adding an open-ended question on the intake form where they could talk about how the alleged offense has impacted them. That could help get the ball rolling.
36. Will: I think these are all really helpful things we'll take back to SWG and we can consider the merits. I think that since we're on board with it one way or the other. I think it might make sense to vote on this now.
37. Laura: To clarify, is there a motion to split?
38. Will: Motion to split the Bylaws and Section
39. Laura: If we're ready to vote, the first will be on everything besides the part about the reporter reading their statement themselves. Are there any concerns about ready to vote right now?
40. Margaret: are we leaving the past conversation just something that you'll figure it out?
41. Mary Holland: I know at SWG, we talked about how there are two standards of arguing. How would arguments look for CC in this timeframe?
42. Will: Because they're in the second one, they are taking some of their time to address whether or not they should be suspended. They would spend some of their time talking about RES, apology letter, etc. That would all be in one speech. They would be expected to address both in the same five minutes.
43. Mary Holland: If the CC is not recommend suspension, is there rational not expected to be included?

44. Will: They would have to say the student is capable of restoring. Other than taking a side on these questions, there's no requirement. They can explain "we don't think they should be suspended for XYZ."
45. Seamus: The Reporter Impact Statement is never defined in the by laws. But, what's the purpose? Is it because the reporter explains the impact, or asking for sanctions? That's the sort of thing I want written down in bold text.
46. Will: In my mind it should be more of an impact statement, but I don't think SWG has reached a conclusion. I agree it should go in the definitions.
47. Laura: We no longer have quorum. We will now shift to discuss the Reporter Impact Statement and who reads it.
48. Will: The reporter can come after submitting the statement. They will come to read that statement and cannot answer questions. There is a world where they just submit the document and come and speak to that.
49. Seamus: Drawing on Carson's statement, I see no reason for the Reporter to show up, read something people have read, and not answer questions. I don't see us gaining information there. I don't see the necessity for that.
50. Penelope: I agree with that. And I'm not exactly sure why we'd have them show up and not answer questions.
51. Will: The idea is that it's important for people to show up and explain the meaning. If a reporter feels really harmed, they should have to come in. It's the same words at the end of the day.
52. Mary Holland: Say a reporter has their impact statement, if they stray from that would it be objected to?
53. Will: Yes, the Chair could.
54. Kessler: I think there's a subset of reporters who would think this is a chance for them to be involved in the process. If we're distinguishing between the Community and Reporter, I think there's a good opportunity for them to answer questions.
55. Rachel: Can we make it clear to reporters that it could be a choice to show up or not?
56. Will: I think that makes sense. It doesn't have to be in the bylaws. It should be in training. They should know they won't be knocked if they don't come.
57. Seamus: I am hesitant to provide an option I'd rather not give them. I personally wouldn't want to create it just as an option. I'm more comfortable just closing all together. It's worthwhile to consider asking them more questions. But that's not the question we're discussing now.
58. Ben: Could you go into more detail about why the PS runs more smoothly when the reporter is not there?
59. Seamus: My opinion is that our goal is to do a restorative approach that is made more difficult, in my impression, where the reporter might not tend to have the best interest of the community at heart. They might be done, and their statement could lean in a less productive way. It could be very punitive in a restorative statement.
60. Will: I see where you're coming from. The reason the bylaws are so reporter focused because so much of restorative justice is about how the affected party has been impacted. I think at least philosophically, more of our work has been towards the Reporter than not.

61. Cassidy: I really think that while the reporter isn't making it easier for the panel, we want to make sure they feel like we're addressing their concerns. Giving them the chance to read in person, they still feel their feelings are just as important at the student. The opportunity for them to be heard is a good one.
62. Laura: We are now at quorum. We can vote on the first By Law (mentioned above).
63. The vote passes.
64. Laura: Second vote for the reporter to have the option.
65. The vote passes.

VII. **NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Vote on the bylaws proposed by the Sanctions Working Group

VIII. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

- A. None.

The Honor Committee adjourned at 8:15 PM and will meet again on Sunday, October 27 at 7:00 p.m. in the Trial Room in Newcomb Hall.