

Committee proposes Honor Code changes

Editor's Note: The following is the text of the Committee on Student Conduct's proposed changes in the UNC Honor Code. Any changes in the 102-year-old Honor Code must be approved by the campus Governing Council, the Faculty Council and Chancellor N. Ferebee Taylor. Publication of the proposal is sponsored by the Committee on Student Conduct, Student Government and the Daily Tar Heel.

Proposal No. 1: Change the language of the Honor Code itself by removing the clause which now requires the student to report any violation of the Honor Code of which he has knowledge.

According to provisions of The Instrument of Student Judicial Governance currently in effect, achievement by a student of enrollment in the University has presupposed a commitment to the Honor Code by the student. The University has acted, therefore, under the assumption that all of its students have been committed to the Honor Code in all of its implications, including the principle of self-regulation.

The Committee on Student Conduct is persuaded that this assumption is no longer valid. While most students do seem willing to abide by the Honor Code in their personal conduct, the Committee believes support for the Code's requirement that students monitor the academic conduct of others is so low as to render it ineffective. The Committee is persuaded, therefore, that the Honor Code should be modified to reflect the values which, in relation to academic integrity, students seem willing to uphold. This could be achieved by deleting from the Honor Code the requirement to monitor the conduct of others.

The Honor Code currently provides as follows:

The Honor Code: It shall be the responsibility of every student at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill to obey the Honor Code, which prohibits lying, cheating or stealing when these actions involve academic processes or University, student or academic personnel acting in an official capacity and which requires the student to report any violations of which he has knowledge.

It is proposed, therefore, that in the statement of the Honor Code in the Instrument, Section I.A.6, footnote 2 (Page 5), and in Section II.A. (Page 7), the Instrument be amended by placing a period after the word "capacity" and deleting the remainder of the sentence.

Proposal No. 2: Remove the words "disregard of the Honor Code" as a specific offense in the Code of Conduct in Section II.D.1.1. (Page 8).

Inclusion of the words "disregard of the Honor Code" in Section II.D.1.1. of the Instrument was intended to bring under the aegis of the Code of Student Conduct that portion of the Honor Code which requires students to report violations of the Honor Code of which they have knowledge. This is accomplished for the remainder of the Honor Code through other sections in the Code of Student Conduct. Since it is proposed that the requirement of reporting be deleted from the Honor Code, removal of this language from the Code of Student Conduct is also proposed.

Proposal No. 3: Modify the sixth basic premise upon which The Instrument of Student Judicial Governance rests, in order (1) to set forth specifically the responsibilities of students in relation to the Honor Code and (2) to provide explicitly that the Faculty shares in the responsibility for ensuring academic integrity in relation to all graded academic work.

The University has traditionally assumed that the nature of the personal responsibility imposed by the Honor Code was understood by those to whom it applied. The Committee on Student Government is persuaded that this assumption is no longer valid. In addition to modifying the language of the Code itself, the Committee believes that a student's personal commitment to the principles of the Honor Code should be buttressed by a more explicit definition of responsibilities which that commitment implies.

The goal of academic integrity in the University has necessitated placement of responsibility for its assurance. As indicated in Proposal No. 1, this responsibility in the past has rested principally upon students under the ideal of student self-government. While students should continue to bear responsibility for ensuring academic integrity in graded work, the Committee believes that this responsibility rightly should be shared by the faculty to the end that a more effective system of academic integrity be achieved. It further believes that, in order to bear this responsibility effectively, the Faculty must also be provided with a definition of its role in ensuring academic integrity in the University.

It is proposed, therefore, that the Section I.A.6. (Page 5) be deleted in its entirety and that the provisions quoted below be substituted therefore.

I.A.6. The Honor Code and the Campus Code, embodying the ideals of academic honesty, integrity and responsible citizenship, govern the performance of all academic work and student conduct at the University. Acceptance by a student of enrollment in the University presupposes a commitment to the principles embodied in these codes.

The discovery and dissemination of knowledge through research, teaching, and learning is the fundamental activity of this academic community. Intellectual honesty is integral to that enterprise. Academic dishonesty in any form is unacceptable, because any breach in academic integrity, however small, strikes destructively at the University's life and work.

In keeping with its nature and its purpose, the University is obligated to inculcate a love for academic pursuits and respect for the values of academic integrity upon which they rest. It is also obligated to protect the community from those who, for whatever reason, do not embody these values in their conduct.

In order to ensure effective functioning of an honor system worthy of respect in this institution, specific responsibilities of the faculty and of students are herein set forth. These responsibilities are not all inclusive. They constitute but the minimum required of members of the faculty and of the student body. Nor are they mutually exclusive. The obligation of a faculty member or a student to uphold the values of academic integrity in this University shall not be lessened or excused by any failure of the other to comply with his responsibility.

The statement of responsibilities below shall not be interpreted to create new offenses or modify existing offenses under the Instrument.

a. Responsibilities of the Faculty

1) To inform students at the beginning of each course and before all graded work (essays, lab reports, math problems, etc.) that the Honor Code, which prohibits giving or receiving unauthorized aid, is in effect. Where appropriate, a clear definition of plagiarism and a reminder of its consequences should be presented, and the extent of permissible collaboration among students in fulfilling academic requirements should be carefully explained.

2) To identify clearly in advance of any examination or other graded work the books, notes, or other materials or aids which may be used; to inform students that materials or aids other than those identified cannot be used; and to require unauthorized materials or aids to be taken from the room or otherwise made inaccessible before the work is undertaken.

3) To require each student on all written work to sign a pledge that the student has neither given nor received unauthorized aid. Grades or other credit should not be awarded for unpledged work.

4) To take all reasonable steps consistent with existing physical classroom conditions — such as requiring students to sit in alternate seats — to reduce the possibility of cheating on graded work.

5) To exercise caution in the preparation, duplication and security of examinations (including make-up examinations) to ensure that students cannot gain improper advance knowledge of their contents.

6) To avoid, when possible, re-use of examinations, in whole or in part, unless they are placed on reserve in the library or

otherwise made available to all students.

7) To exercise supervision of the class during an examination, both to discourage cheating and to detect any which may occur. Supervision includes proper security in the distribution and collection of examination papers and presence in the classroom by the instructor or an authorized substitute.

8) To report to the Office of the Student Attorney General or the Office of Student Affairs any instance in which reasonable grounds exist to believe that a student has given or received unauthorized aid in graded work. When possible, consultation with the student should precede reporting. Private action as a sanction for academic cheating, including the assignment for disciplinary reasons for a failing grade in the course, is inconsistent with the Instrument and shall not be used in lieu of or in addition to a report of the incident.

9) To cooperate with the Office of the Student Attorney General and the defense counsel in the investigation and trial of any incident of alleged violation, including the giving of testimony when called upon.

b. Responsibility of Students

1) To conduct all academic work within the letter and spirit of the Honor Code which prohibits the giving or receiving of unauthorized aid in all academic pursuits.

2) To consult with faculty and other sources to clarify the meaning of plagiarism; to learn the recognized techniques of

accomplished, the section now serves no useful purpose. It is proposed that it be deleted.

Proposal No. 5: Stipulate that suspension is the normative sanction for conviction in first academically related offenses.

The impression exists among many members of the Faculty and among many students that sanctions imposed by the courts are unduly light. The belief has been expressed that disciplinary probation, the current normative sanction, is essentially meaningless to the student. The sole meaningful sanction open to the student courts has been suspension from the University. Yet the student courts in the last few years have been increasingly reluctant to impose this sanction. Disciplinary data support that impression, as the following table shows:

Suspension of Students Convicted of Honor Code Offenses in the Undergraduate Courts	
Year	Percentage
1969-70	16.0
1970-71	22.0
1971-72	12.0
1972-73	7.0
1973-74	4.0
1974-75	2.0
1975-76	5.0
1976-77	3.0



UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

OFFICIAL EXAMINATION BOOK
(24 Pages — Ruled)

Name of Student _____
Date of Examination _____
Subject _____ No. _____

HONORABLE CONDUCT

In academic work is the spirit of conduct in this university

In recognition of and in the spirit of the honor code, I certify that I have neither given nor received aid on this examination and that I will report all Honor Code violations observed by me.

(Signed) _____ name

SUGGESTIONS FOR CONDUCT

1. Occupy alternate seats when possible.
2. When in doubt as to the meaning of a question, consult the instructor. He can be found in his office.



proper attribution of sources used in the preparation of written work; and to identify allowable resource materials or aids to be used during examinations or in completion of any graded work.

3) To sign a pledge on all graded academic work certifying that no unauthorized assistance has been received or given in the completion of the work.

4) To comply with faculty regulations designed to reduce the possibility of cheating — such as removing unauthorized materials or aids from the room and protecting one's own examination paper from view to others.

5) To maintain the confidentiality of examinations by divulging no information concerning an examination, directly or indirectly, to another student yet to write that same examination.

6) To report any instance in which reasonable grounds exist to believe that a student has given or received unauthorized aid in graded work. Although failure to report shall not constitute a violation of the Code of Student Conduct, the moral obligation is inherent in an honor system. Such report should be made to the Office of the Student Attorney General or the Office of Student Affairs.

7) To cooperate with the Office of the Student Attorney General and the defense counsel in the investigation and trial of any incident of alleged violation, including the giving of testimony when called upon. Nothing herein shall be construed to contravene a student's rights enumerated in Section V.A.2.b. of the Instrument.

Proposal No. 4: Delete Section I.B.

This section of the Instrument outlined the means by which the Instrument would be ratified. Ratification having been

original jurisdiction for removal of indefinite sanctions, while definite sanctions expire automatically.

As a part of its concern to provide the courts with sanctions which are more meaningful than those currently available, the Committee on Student Conduct believes there should be a clearer differentiation between definite and indefinite sanctions than now exists. The requirement that defendants appear before the court to request their reinstatement or removal in the case of indefinite sanctions should be retained. The purpose of this appearance is to provide the court an opportunity to assess improvement in the defendant's attitude and to form some impression of the positive effect — if any — the sanction may have had. The committee believes that constructive change in the defendant should be a condition for removal of the indefinite sanction. It also believes that the condition is vitiated unless the sanction also mandates a passage of time sufficient for such change to occur. Thus the minimum length of indefinite sanctions should be increased.

Implementation of this proposal requires that amendments be made to two sections of the Instrument. The necessary change in the section on probation will be covered in Proposal No. 7.

Section III.B.2.a. (Page 12) now states that sentences of suspension may be

"indefinite suspension which severs the student's relationship for no less than the remainder of the semester or summer session in which the sanction is imposed."

It is proposed that the words "the remainder of" be removed and the words "one full semester beyond" be inserted at the same place.

Proposal No. 7: Make probationary sanctions more meaningful.

While probationary sanctions do have a substantial impact upon students who are actively engaged in extracurricular activities (by prohibiting varsity athletes, for instance, from playing in scheduled games of their sport), they hold little or no meaning for most students who come before the courts. The belief that suspension is the University's only effective sanction has already been expressed. Yet concern is often voiced that meaningful options to suspension be provided for use in appropriate cases.

In view of that concern, the Committee on Student Conduct believes that probationary sanctions provided in the Instrument should be made more meaningful. Two means are proposed. The first prohibits induction into campus honorary societies. As currently stated, students on probation may not join a fraternity or a sorority or participate in intramural sports. They may, however, be selected in campus honoraries. The committee believes this latter permissiveness is inconsistent with the Honor System. It believes that no person on disciplinary probation should be eligible for selection to a campus honor society.

The second mandates that students placed on probation avail themselves of counseling services provided by an appropriate University officer whom the Committee believes should be designated the Honor Code Counselor. Recent experiences with specific defendants have demonstrated both the need and the benefits of appropriate counseling for students in this context. Academic cheating may often be a symptom of other problems in the resolution of which the student could constructively be assisted.

In addition, no efforts beyond the adjudicatory process itself have been undertaken to give the disciplinary system an educational component. The Honor Code Counselor, meeting regularly with students on probation, can enhance the educational and rehabilitative value of this sanction. Therefore, the committee recommends that the office be created and assigned as a responsibility to a professional staff member in the Office of Student Affairs.

As addressed in Proposal No. 6, the sentence of indefinite probation should be extended in length to no less than one full semester beyond the semester of summer session in which the sanction is imposed.

In order to effect these changes, it is proposed that the current Section III.B.3 (Pages 12-13) of the Instrument be removed in its entirety and be replaced by the following.

III.B.3. Probation permits continuation of the relationship between the student and the University; however, the following conditions apply: In every case the sentence prohibits the student from officially representing the University or from participating in any extracurricular activities, including intramural competitions, except that membership in fraternities, sororities or special residential arrangements held at the time of sentencing may continue. Students on probation shall report regularly to the Honor Code Counselor (see IV.A.3.) who will provide individual counsel and ensure compliance with the terms of probation. Sentences of probation may be:

a. Indefinite, which carries a length of sentence no less than one full semester beyond the semester or summer session in which the sanction is imposed. For removal of the probationary sanction, formal petition must be made to the court then having original jurisdiction over the offense involved. Prior to acting on any petition, the court shall secure and consider a report and recommendation from the Honor Code Counselor.

b. Definite, which is imposed for a specified period of time, the terminal date of which shall coincide with the official ending of an academic semester or summer session.

Proposal No. 8: Create the position of an Honor Code Counselor.

The role of the Honor Code Counselor has been discussed in Proposal No. 7. The purpose of this proposal is to provide for the position in the Instrument. It is proposed that a new Section IV.A.3. be included in The Instrument of Student Judicial Governance and that the designation of the present Section IV.A.3. (Page 18) be changed to IV.A.4. The new section shall be read as follows:

IV.A.3. Honor Code Counselor

a. The Honor Code Counselor shall be appointed by the Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs from among his staff.

b. Functions of the Honor Code Counselor shall include:

1) Regular mandatory conferences with all students placed on indefinite or definite probation. Conferences may be held by the counselor or by other administrators under his supervision. Assurance of each student's compliance with the terms of his probation.

3) Provision of reports and recommendations to the courts concerning the removal of sanctions of indefinite probation.

Proposal No. 9: Define more precisely the kind of sanctions authorized in The Instrument of Student Judicial Governance.

The sanctions imposed under authority of the Instrument are disciplinary in nature. It is affirmed that all academic evaluations (such as low or failing grades for academic work adjudged by the instructor to be poor) are the sole prerogative of the faculty. All disciplinary sanctions imposed for violations of the Code of Student Conduct (including a failing grade in the course involved, imposed for conviction of a student on a grade-related offense of the Honor Code) are the prerogative of the courts as provided in the Instrument. The new Section I.A.6.a.8) in Proposal No. 3, above, stipulated that:

"private action as a sanction for academic cheating, including the assignment for disciplinary reasons of a failing grade in the course, is inconsistent with the Instrument and shall not be used in lieu of or in addition to a report of the incident."

Consistent with this understanding, the Committee believes the language in two other sections of the Instrument should be more carefully stated.

It is proposed, therefore, that in Section II.F. (Page 10) the word "disciplinary" be inserted between the words "or" and "sanction" in the last full line of the sentence, making the clause read "...offense shall be recognized or disciplinary sanction imposed..."

It is further proposed that in Section III.B.5. (Page 13) the words "academic sanctions" be changed to read "a sanction."