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

I. The Honor Congress

All is not well with the Honor System.

For more than 170 years, ours has been one of the most famously effective honor codes in the nation. And yet, today, fewer than 5% of student-observed Honor offenses are reported; those reports that are filed are demographically disproportionate; juries’ verdicts are often tremendously inconsistent; and some faculty have abandoned the System altogether.

The Honor System belongs to us. We are its stewards. It is time that we address these problems, together.

Tomorrow, join the Honor Committee at 5 p.m. in the Special Collections Library for the first ever Honor Congress. The Congress will be centered around informal, small-group discussions to find solutions for our Community of Trust. You need no experience with Honor - only yourselves and your ideas. Dinner will be provided.

II. Conscientious Retractions and Informed Retractions

Two students have had the courage and integrity to come forward and file Conscientious Retractions since the previous newsletter. (To learn more about filing a CR, click here.)

**CR 1:** In December, a student filed a CR for cheating on an exam by looking up two questions on a cell phone.

**CR 2:** In February, a student filed a CR for cheating on a quiz by looking at another student’s paper.

One student has filed an Informed Retraction since the previous newsletter. (To learn more about the IR, click here.)

**IR 1:** In March, a student was reported for plagiarizing on a paper. The student admitted to the Honor Offense and filed an IR.

III. "LAGs" and Honor Trials

One students has Left Admitting Guilt ("LAGGED") since the previous newsletter.
LAG 1: A student was reported for plagiarizing on a paper. The student decided to forgo the investigation process and Leave Admitting Guilt.

There has been one trial since the previous newsletter. Note: all public summaries are written using the masculine gender for purposes of confidentiality.

**Trial 1:** A student in the College of Arts of Sciences was accused of plagiarizing on a paper and annotated bibliography in the fall of 2012. The case was reported by the professor. The Community argued that the Accused Student had copied blocks of text from sources found online without providing proper citations and that parts of the paper were cited with sources not found in the bibliography. The Community further argued that the Honor policies for the class were reviewed sufficiently at the beginning of the semester, and that the professor had dedicated a week to reviewing citations and citation policies after he noticed the Accused Student struggling with citations on an assignment leading up to this final paper. The Accused Student stated that he had difficulties with reading and writing because of his learning disabilities and that he did not have enough experience with research papers to sufficiently understand citation policies. The student also argued that with his rigorous schedule, arranging a time to meet with the professor was difficult; that the ambiguous grading scale for the class did not reflect the student’s need for consultation; and that the professor did not convey to the student his belief that the student needed additional help. A Panel of randomly selected students found the Accused Student not guilty based on Act and Knowledge.

Want to stay connected with Honor?
   Like us on Facebook
   Follow us on Twitter
   Visit our website

Did you get this email from a friend?
   Sign up for the newsletter here

Comments, questions, concerns?
   Just reply to this email!