Welcome to The Honor Newsletter! This twice-a-semester update is your one-stop-shop for all things Honor.

I. Referenda Updates

Last February, a referenda passed the student body asking Honor to "consider a multi-sanction system." The Referenda Subcommittee is the Honor Committee's response to this non-binding student vote. The Referenda Subcommittee will bring together a diverse group of students from all over the school to work together to tackle a proposal for the February election.

Please fill out this form with your opinion. If you indicate on the form that you want to continue to be involved with the effort, you will be invited to join the conversation in person.

II. Education & Outreach News

Dorm Reps
Application due September 28

As a dorm representative, you will act as a resource for your dorm and provide Honor with the feedback you gather from your hallmates, apartmentmates, or suitemates. Specifically, dorm reps will be required to attend one two-hour training session, plan an outreach event in the dorm, answer honor-related questions, engage with your community, and stay up-to-date with the goings on of the Honor Committee. Find out more at our website (www.virginia.edu/honor/join-honor) or find the application here.

Diversity Initiative Award
Due Date: October 16
Honor has pledged $500 awards to six students. More information can be found on Honor's website.

**Community Relations and Diversity Advisory Committee Meeting**  
**Wednesday, September 30, at 9 p.m.**

The Community Relations and Diversity Advisory Committee (CRDAC) meets every other Wednesday, 9 to 10 p.m. Please contact the Vice Chair for Community Relations VJ Jenkins (vlj5bf@virginia.edu) if you would like to attend.

**Student Athletes Committed to Honor**

Student Athletes Committed to Honor (SACH) met last week to start the discussion about Honor and the student-athlete community. Email Zach Watson (zww3ga) or Zach Wood (zdw7bk) to find out more or get in contact with your team’s representative.

**Sexual Assault Resource Agency Breakfast**

Honor will be co-sponsoring the Sexual Assault Resource Agency breakfast on November 20 as a demonstrated effort to continue our support of the end of sexual violence.

**Medical School Diversity Symposium**

On Monday, September 14, Honor co-sponsored the Medical School's Diversity Symposium in conjunction with the office of Diversity and Equity. The symposium focused on the evolving medical field and its need for better connectivity to patients amongst minority communities.

**Black Book**

Honor co-sponsored this year's Black Book, a book dedicated to making the transition to college more feasible for black first-year students. The book welcomed first-year students with advice, introduced them to lingo, and acquainted them with traditions.
### III. Case Processing Updates

**CR:** The Honor System permits a student to atone for his or her mistakes by filing a Conscientious Retraction (CR). A valid and complete CR involves the admission of a possible Honor Offense before the student has reason to believe that such offense has come under suspicion by anyone.

**IR:** The Informed Retraction (IR) permits a student to atone for his or her mistakes after an Honor Report has been made. An IR is predicated on a student taking responsibility for the commission of an Honor Offense and making amends with all affected parties. A student must then take a two-semester leave of absence from the University.

| **CR:** In April, a student filed a CR for cheating on a homework assignment by collaborating with another student. |
| **IR:** In February, a student filed an IR for cheating on an exam by looking at the paper of a student near him. |
| **IR:** In May, a student filed an IR for cheating on a computer science homework assignment by copying code from another student. |
| **IR:** In May, a student filed an IR for plagiarizing his part of a group assignment. |
| **IR:** In May, a student filed an IR for submitting a student's assignment from a previous year as her own. |
| **IR:** In September, a student filed an IR for plagiarizing elements of a final paper in an economics class. |
| **IR:** In September, a student filed an IR for unauthorized collaboration on a take-home final exam that was intended to be an individual assignment. |
| **IR:** In September, a student filed an IR for taking an assignment off of his roommate's computer without his permission, and submitting that assignment as his own work. |
IV. Honor Hearings

**Hearing 1**: A student in the College of Arts & Sciences was accused of cheating on four laboratory reports in a Chemistry class. The case was reported by the professor. The Community argued that the student plagiarized significant portions of text and figures from a previous year's student. Moreover, the Community argued that the student admitted to committing an Honor offense in an exchange of emails with the professor. The Accused Student argued that scientific writing is restrictive and reports are expected to have similarities. The student met with the previous year's student to gain clarity on the structure and format of the lab reports and to learn how to concisely write the reports. A panel of randomly-selected students found the Accused Student guilty.

**Hearing 2**: A student in the College of Arts & Sciences was accused of cheating on a final exam by using unauthorized resources. Another student in the course reported the case. The Community argued that the student was witnessed accessing both electronic and paper resources repeatedly throughout the exam. They argued that the accused student's recounting of the events in question were inconsistent with the resources turned in at the end of the exam. They argued that the use of these unauthorized resources would constitute cheating and be incompatible with a Community of Trust. The accused student argued that she only used authorized paper resources, including sheets of scratch paper designed for calculations, and that while her electronic resource was not in fact an authorized resource, it was used only for authorized functions. This function included primarily its use as a calculator, and that she derived no tangible benefit beyond what was explicitly allowed for the final exam. A panel of randomly-selected students found the Accused Student not guilty on the basis of Significance.

**Hearing 3**: A student in the College of Arts & Sciences was accused of cheating on several homework assignments in a computer science class and then lying about his actions. The case was reported by the course professor. After the professor received the homework assignments (all submitted at once after their deadlines had passed), he determined that it was very likely that the Accused Student copied large sections of code from his lab partner. The professor subsequently confronted both students and ultimately decided that only the Accused Student was involved in the act of cheating. The Community argued that the Accused Student copied the work of another student in the
claiming it as his own. The Accused Student, while acknowledging that the assignments were submitted through his email account and likely copied from another student, argued that he did not actually send those emails or even complete the assignments in the first place. The Accused Student then suggested that it was possible another person had access to his NetBadge account and independently submitted the homework assignments. The Community countered that it would be highly difficult for another student to gain access to his NetBadge account, carry on a conversation with the professor over many hours, and know exactly which homework assignments to submit for credit, all without the Accused Student's knowledge. The Community concluded by arguing the Accused Student submitted the homework assignments knowing that they were copied, and then knowingly lied about it to avoid further consequences, two acts that are detrimental to the Community of Trust. A mixed panel of randomly-selected students and Committee members found the student guilty of both lying and cheating.

**Hearing 4**: A student in the College of Arts & Sciences was accused of cheating by using unauthorized materials on a closed-book, in-class exam in a history class. The case was reported by a student who was sitting behind the accused student. The Community argued that the student had several scraps of paper that appeared to be ripped from a notebook paper and that the student was consistently taking them out of his pocket, shielding them from the students around him and studying the notes on the scraps. The Community also claimed that the student did well on the relatively fact-based portion of the exam because of the notes and poorly on the analytical portion. The Accused argued that the scraps of paper were gum wrappers, and that the student did not cheat on the exam. He simply replaced his gum two or three times throughout the exam period. Because the reporter did not directly see any written material on the scraps of paper, they claimed the student could not be found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. A mixed panel of Committee members and randomly-selected student panelists found the student not guilty because there was not enough evidence outside of the testimony of one eye-witness (the reporter) to prove that cheating occurred beyond a reasonable doubt.