7:58 start time

Wished everyone a happy thanksgiving, witnesses ordered out and hearing begun. Alfredo begins to read a prepared statement that the unfair scrutiny began early in the year. Had a positive discussion with the Honor Court chair. Felt like there were discrepancies between the talk and the confirmation hearing. Positive statement on the student government system. Emphasis that there is no vendetta and this is solely about potential wrongdoing in the process. Statement concludes.

Question asked as to what specific pushback existed. Interpersonal relations at core of the nomination process, and underlying pushback emphasized. All feedback from Chair was positive, so pushback must have began during the academic year. Feels that started during an honor court hearing, and a particularly heated honor court hearing. Received an email from Mary Beth to retract his nomination very late in the process. Met less than a month before and no concerns were mentioned.

The test occurred in the fall of 2018, had taken other exam in spring 2018. Apparently the questions on the same exam had the correct answers changed, specifically the one around intent. Shortly after was removed from Honor Court listserv, set as a provisional member. Commitment to court set in question even after participating multiple times in summer hearings. Attendance in meetings also constant, apparently better than some members. Attended summer training that 1/4 of the court went to. Should be logged and verifiable.

Final summary given.

Was a nominee for COSC from Spring 2018 (interviewed close to finals) for COSC. No complaints over the summer were raised over his conduct or his track record until the week before the nomination. Earlier that month “past grievances” were a reason. Discussed concerns with Savannah Putnam after his Honor Court case and she suggested COSC. Spoke to Mary Beth face to face and apparently Savannah had informed Mary Beth that there was a conversation between them. Savannah was apparently very concerned about his answers in the conversation when she spoke to Mary Beth. At this meeting Alfredo had also discussed a private issue with Savannah as well and expected it to be handled in private. Apparently Mary Beth knew about this private conversation as well. Private issue was about a friend that may have been in trouble and needed a title IX intervention or CAPS assistance. Concerns raised about this individual’s ability to perform in a professional capacity in this kind of situation.

Question asked if Alfredo was promised the position. Responded that he never was promised any position. The night before the nomination process, Alfredo was informed that the Office of Student Conduct, Savannah, and Mary Beth all had concerns about the nomination. Savannah and Oscha were the only people notified about the mutual friend.

Question asked if Mary Beth ever knew specifically about the mutual friend. Responded that Mary Beth was notified about the conversation between him and Savannah.

Question of reason in the email to remove nomination. Responded that “past grievances” were the reason, specifically his demonstrated feelings about the Honor Court. Believes it was because of his past Honor Court proceedings.

Passionate argument was with a vice chair (Elizabeth) about the severity and kind of sanction levied on the student. Butted heads specifically over sanctions.

Second interview was this academic year, interviewed for a different position than COSC and yet received a nomination for COSC. Under the impression that he was interviewing for Supreme Court or Student Safety. Received an email from both cycles that he was a nominee for COSC.

Explanation asked for on interpersonal relationships. Honor Court leadership is very close knit. Alfredo perceives as a pack mentality. Email received requesting his withdrawal included the Honor Court System, the Office of Student Conduct, and the Student Attorney General’s office.

Asked again for clarification for the reason for withdrawal. “Combative nature” with leadership cited multiple times as a reason. Probably originated in his discussion with the Office of Student Conduct.

Discussion revolves around relevance of friend. Probably turned friend in for something and friend began to rile up her social group which included Savannah and Mary Beth. Most relevant thing is probably the email that was sent the night before, only found out about provisional status through the door during the hearing.

Did not know that he had provisional status on the Honor Court. Oscha was present during some of the conversations.

Savannah now called in. Seems very relaxed. Not 100% sure why she is here.

Asked about the process of confirming appointments. EBO and Cabinet are filled in the Spring while everything else is filled in the fall.

Met with Alfredo, agrees with his time of the meeting. All she remembers is giving him Mary Beth’s contact information to talk about Honor Court. Not sure if she recommended COSC, not sure if she knew what it was at the time. May have suggested getting involved in Honor Court in general.

Asking about private conversation about the incapacitated individual. Apparently the individual was only in the running and is not on the executive board. Private reason was not shared and was not the reason she was denied.

Apparently doesn’t recall any conversation with Mary Beth about Alfredo.

There is no reason for the mutual friend to be upset towards Alfredo or for any reason according to Savannah.

Not aware of the concerns around Alfredo before the hearing.

Savannah doesn’t really make suggestions, doesn’t really have a hand in choosing nominees. No magic list of nominees.

Mary Beth called in. Asks IMMEDIATELY about the right to counsel. Also asks about prior testimony. ALSO not aware as to what she is here for.

Informed about Alfredo’s testimony about the email the night before his confirmation and her discussions with Honor Court leadership. Asked to fill in the gaps in the Honor Court process.

Attempts at transparency made clear.

Summary given. Unaware of COSC nominees in the Spring and asked Savannah when the applications went live. Savannah directed her to Emily and she was informed that they already happened. Didn’t come to attention who the nominees were until the fall semester began, and she realized Alfredo was up. The chair before this academic year didint do a good jo with selectind and taraing people and she tried to fix this in her term as leader of the Honor Court. Need to find out what larger issues and personal issues are. Not usually an issue with Honor Courts, but last year was rough. She was VERY busy over the summer but kept up with Megan Messier who is graduating in a week and a half. Last year’s chair didn’t manage staff to the tee of the Honor System, so she spoke with the Office of Student Conduct. To be fair, the test has to be administered to find discrepancies in individuals and in what the court as a whole didn’t know.

To become a member of the Honor COurt, you have to pass the entry exam. Apparently the past chair didn’t make people take the test at a certain time interval, and not sure about the content of the test/how often people actually utilized their skills. Mary Beth made a MUCH more firm exam and ensured that everyone took it. Left the exam open for a week and a half, and allowed an appeal process for people who were affected by Florence. Alfredo didn’t submit the test initially but retook the test. Poor performance = under 75%. Multiple graders used blind techniques. Alfredo did make an 80-something. Unanonymized the grades with leadership and discussed about each member of Honor Court. Had formal check-ins with multiple people, but these hinged on multiple factors beyond a score. Concerns outside the courtroom, and inside the courtroom apparently he seemed slightly distractible. Also known for disagreeability in his discussion process. Vice Chair Elizabeth doesn’t exist.

Asked about meeting that they had within a month of joining COSC. Asked also about her positivity towards his nomination. Responds that she tries to stay very polite and cordial/supportive under any professional circumstances. Figured that since he was already on COSC (he wasn’t) she should try to get along with him. Also realized that he didn’t know what the committee was supposed to do, which raised a major red flag. Then tried to raise concerns with the committee.

Asked about her choice to communicate on such short notice with Alfredo, and apparently she met with Alfredo on 10/5. The R + J hearing was on 10/9. Extremely busy with school, but decided to meet with Office of Student Conduct as previously scheduled on the afternoon of 10/8. Had already decided to come to the R + J meeting because Alfredo had negative interactions with the Honor System. Savannah’s conclusion was that he disliked the Honor System.

Asked about if Alfredo was notified about his provisional status. Apparently during the sitdown he listened to the concerns about his conduct during hearings and his issues away from the courtroom that may or may not have included inappropriate conduct with another Honor Court member. Was made clear that concerns were present on his performance/issues, but not sure if he knew he was on provisional status. Email was sent after the meeting with the Office of Student Conduct in the interest of transparency and to communicate her concerns clearly before the hearing.

The email seemed very cordial and clearly stated concerns present with his performance. Apparently the feedback form had rolled out later than expected. Vice chairs had lots of emails to send after meetings, and if there was one that would slip through the cracks, it’d be the feedback form. 2 - 5 hearings per week, so anyone that they can find to staff during their summer court is wild. The number of hearings and the logistical difficulty is insane. Very difficult, and people work incredibly hard to make it happen while working jobs. Feedback fell down on the list of priorities.

The main reason that Mary Beth chose to ask him to remove his name from consideration was because she wanted to warn him that context would be given during his R + J hearing and that she would be present.

The reason Alfredo was placed on provisional status was his distraction level during cases and his defensive/unfocused behavior during deliberations. Savannah’s comments to Mary Beth were that he didn’t like the Honor System and was on the Honor System.

Known that he was found not responsible in his own case, and his own concerns/complaints were lost in translation by someone further down the line. His anger is more with his own case and how difficult his process was, and that loss of belief in the system may have been behind his ordering of the hearing or perception of his own issues. Apparently had a discussion with Alfredo afterward and reached closure, so ordering the hearing was a surprise.

About his conduct with the other member in an inappropriate manner, it was more a piece of gossip rather than a formal complaint. Mary Beth is aware. He hasn’t discussed that much on COSC, but has been present and has voted.

Concerns were brought because of Alfredo because she had working experience with him and she could give context - the other three nominees were AG staff. She makes sure that she does her due diligence (extremely detailed Google Calendar).

General consensus is that this is a failure of communication, and nothing other than Savannah’s conversation was a contradiction, and that was testimony about a passing conversation from six months ago.

Margaret brought in, given background in case.

Talks about the way that Mary Beth has reformed the Honor Court. Put Alfredo on provisionary status because of his performance, and she is aware of the meeting. Thinks COSC should be accessible, but his status as a provisional member should have probably been held in higher status. Trusted that deputies were thorough in vetting. Good relationship with Alfredo, but still had concerns about his status as a member of COSC. COSC has worked well in her opinion this year. Bringing in people to interview about leadership positions but nudging them in a different direction when they may not be a good fit is fairly common.

As for the discussion the Monday before the nomination, she didn’t have much to say about Alfredo’s performance. There weren’t many people put on provisional status. Mary Beth decided to send the email after a fairly brief conversation with Honor Court leadership.

Conversation had about the understanding portion of the hearing, want to ensure that Alfredo does feel welcome on COSC and in the Honor System.

Megan asks IMMEDIATELY about rights. Right to counsel stated, notified that no allegations are brought. Asks about the purpose of the investigation, respond with the aforementioned purpose. Asks about second hearing and if it is being recorded, answers yes and we have someone taking minutes. Do not discuss outcome until after full Senate.

Deputy Chair of the Undergrad Honor Court. Knows Alfredo did summer Court. Know that he was appointed as a representative to COSC, aware of questions in the past about him. Aware about the email the night before the nomination. Day of the hearing she testified against him and he was appointed.

Asked about the feedback system in the Honor Court, specifically about the post-case survey. Spoke about his performance being okay on the exam, specifically needed to talk about his views on intent. The interpretation of intent may have changed with the chair, more old issues coming up that were getting resolved. Expressed that he may have needed more experience. Didn’t feel he was the best fit, however didn’t feel that he was incapable of growth. Didn’t feel that opposition was the best option, so Mary Beth acted on her own. Hard to know who specifically brought the concerns to Mary Beth initially, hard to tell how she was made aware of that information. Do say that they don’t just take random concerns, and that Oscha put a few forward. Said that she never met alone with Alfredo or spoke to Oscha about him at any point. When Alfredo did meet with the group of them, they did refer him to Oscha to speak about any concerns he had.

Will is called in. Asks about the purpose of the hearing and is told that it is to find the whole story behind Alfredo’s nomination. Also asks if he can get a summary of the facts of the hearing to this point, which is supplied.

Did not know Alfredo prior to his appointment to COSC, found out he was nominated during the summer. Concerns about his knowledge of COSC and the opinions of Honor Court leaders connected to him. Cannot recall exact time that he heard concerns about Alfredo, but it was probably around the beginning of the school year. Casual conversation during cabinet (Deputies, senior AG staff and Mary Beth’s staff) meetings was the most likely place that these concerns were discussed. Didn’t know specifics and figured they would be handled. Most experience with Alfredo was during fall training with his questions. Aware that other members would handle it. Small talked with Mary Beth about Alfredo, and knew that she was working on how to address these concerns. Witnessed the email being written, but really didn’t contribute to calling Alfredo’s fate. Feels like the Honor System isn’t a place for people to prove themselves, that it is a place that you need to know what you are doing. COSC is the body that oversees that system, so in order to be an effective member you must know the specifics of the Instrument and it helps to have lots of experience with cases. Intent refers to the state of mind/malice during an offense, and there was a change in the way intent was applied to charges.

No closing announcements.

10:32 adjournment.