



Minutes

Hate Speech Working Group
Codes and Judicial Committee
University Assembly
February 23, 2018
1:00pm – 2:00pm
Mann Library Conference Room 100

I. Call to Order

R. Lieberwitz called the meeting to order at 1:03 PM.

- a. Attendance:
 - i. *Present*: D. Barbaria, M. Battaglia, A. El Sabrout, S. Grantz, R. Lieberwitz, V. Price, C. Riley, S. Seth
 - ii. *Absent*: T. Cabbell
- b. Introductions and Welcome
 - i. All present introduced themselves briefly.
 - ii. R. Lieberwitz mentioned a desire for less formality.

II. General Issues about the Hate Speech Working Group (HSWG)

- a. Charge to the HSWG
 - i. Discussion concerning the general charge and general meeting time moving forward.
 - ii. Discussion concerning guidance documents for Code (comparison to Laws having Regulations to add detail).
 - iii. V. Price asked what outcome if recommendation made is outside the Campus Code of Conduct?
 - iv. M. Battaglia said that any recommendation or outcome was welcome and that the recommendations are not limited to the code, for example could include creation or modification of guidance, etc.
- b. Membership of the HSWG
 - i. General discussion and explanation about the membership structure of the Working Group.
 - ii. Working Group is almost fully staffed, only missing one Staff Member. Final member being sought, hope to have filled shortly.
- c. Public nature of the HSWG's meetings
 - i. A. El Sabrout requested that meetings be advertised more than 24 hours in advance of their occurrence.
 - 1. Discussion that once meeting time is standardized meetings can be set and notification provided further in advance.

- ii. V. Price noted that some members of the public might be unaware of how the Assemblies define “public” and be unaware that they can submit written comments to the group.

- 1. Extra steps will be taken to ensure messaging makes it clear that the public is free to attend as well as comment upon pending business as well as generally.

d. Timeline

- i. Discussion about the preliminary timeline from October 2017.
- ii. A. El. Sabrout asked who produced the timeline?
- iii. M. Battaglia responded that the CJC and others created it as a roughly six week outline for how things might be structured.
- iv. R. Lieberwitz noted a desire to be expedient but inclusive in the handling of this matter.
- v. A. El. Sabrout expressed concerns that a month was insufficient time and that the group should look at least at two months.
- vi. R. Lieberwitz discussed the Presidential Task Force, their timeline, and how the Working Group would be able to submit questions to a survey they were putting together.
- vii. S. Grantz asked if there was overlap with the Working Group’s charge and that of the Presidential Task Force.
- viii. R. Lieberwitz stated there is some overlap however the Presidential Task Force’s job is just to make recommendations.
- ix. S. Seth asked what are the different methods by which actions can be taken?
- x. R. Lieberwitz replied that the Working Group can directly propose to change the code through the CJC.
- xi. M. Battaglia noted that this Task Force appeared somewhat similar to the Outdoor Space Working Group in that they are tasked with coming up with some recommendations, some which may be able to be unilaterally implemented, others however might require the UA or CJC to act on them prior to becoming operative.

III. Ideas for Information Gathering

- i. R. Lieberwitz asked how the group could come up with survey questions and circulated draft questions from the Presidential Task Force.
- ii. Brief general discussion about survey questions.
- iii. R. Lieberwitz provided general background on the Task Force.
 - 1. Discussion about Task Force timeline

2. Task Force goals.
 - a. Recommendations for:
 - i. Immediate action
 - ii. 3-6 months goals
 - iii. 6-12 months goals
 - iv. Aspirational goals
 - iv. S. Seth discussed the first forum, what question are we asking and how does the timeline work into that?
 - v. M. Battaglia said the timeline is flexible and was created to be illustrative and as a guideline for how things could operate.
 - vi. R. Lieberwitz provided additional discussion and context.
 - vii. S. Seth asked what problem the Working Group was created to address?
 - viii. A. El. Sabrout said that in his experience there are concerns over student safety regarding threatening behavior. Issue with nothing happening when complaints were made. In past, some students have been told that people are “too sensitive” and there is a frustration with a perceived lack of action.
 - ix. S. Seth discussed separating from what the Code currently does and is already covered.
 - x. S. Grantz asked how do you separate from jurisdictional limits in the code?
 - xi. A. El. Sabrout raised a concern over enforcement.
 - xii. M. Battaglia explained the jurisdictional limits of the Code and concern at hearing that provisions in it may not be being enforced.
 - xiii. A. El. Sabrout stated a concern about two issues:
 1. Complexity of the Code and policies to general students.
 2. That there is a belief that this is more than an enforcement issue.

IV. Planning Open Forum(s)

- i. R. Lieberwitz summarized key points from the HSWG discussion about what the forum(s) can address:
 1. Identify issues and events that concern people
 2. Educate the public about existing code provisions and other policies
 3. Identify changes that may be needed, including amendments to the CCC and/or ways to improve enforcement of existing CCC provisions.

- ii. S. Grantz brought up the name of the Group as a whole stating that it appeared loaded and asking if we are looking at Hate Speech or harassment? Discussed that the name may need to be changed.
- iii. S. Seth expressed similar concerns but that the bar may be too high for what is considered hate speech.
- iv. M. Battaglia noted that the name was derived from the original charge to the CJC by the UA but that concerns have been noted on both sides of the issue. The name can be changed if the CJC approves.

V. Scheduling Working Group Meetings

- i. R. Lieberwitz noted the time and that the meeting was almost at its conclusion. Asked when a good time to schedule an additional meeting was.
- ii. Discussion about selecting a time next week and from that meeting then selecting a permanent time.
- iii. M. Battaglia offered to send an availability poll out to the group if necessary.
- iv. S. Seth expressed a desire for members to bring concrete cases or if necessary fictitious examples to the next meeting so the group can workshop them to help determine where the group is going and how to address the issues the community is facing.
- v. M. Battaglia noted that the October Forum may have had some examples provided, would review notes concerning them.
- vi. Brief discussion concerning the Task Force's survey questions, agreement that there is no need to "reinvent the wheel", goal of working on questions in person at the next meeting.
- vii. Discussion about next meeting time. Those present agreed upon 3:30 PM on Wednesday, February 28. Messages will be sent to those not present or who had to depart early to confirm their availability for that time.

VI. Adjournment

- a. R. Lieberwitz adjourned the meeting at 2:04 PM.