

Honor Code

- A. The Honor Code is an undertaking of the students, individually and collectively:
1. that they will not give or receive aid in examinations; that they will not give or receive unpermitted aid in class work, in the preparation of reports, or in any other work that is to be used by the instructor as the basis of grading;
 2. that they will do their share and take an active part in seeing to it that others as well as themselves uphold the spirit and letter of the Honor Code.
- B. The faculty on its part manifests its confidence in the honor of its students by refraining from proctoring examinations and from taking unusual and unreasonable precautions to prevent the forms of dishonesty mentioned above. The faculty will also avoid, as far as practicable, academic procedures that create temptations to violate the Honor Code.
- C. While the faculty alone has the right and obligation to set academic requirements, the students and faculty will work together to establish optimal conditions for honorable academic work.

Examples of conduct which have been regarded as being in violation of the Honor Code include:

- Copying from another's examination paper or allowing another to copy from one's own paper
- Unpermitted collaboration
- Plagiarism
- Revising and resubmitting a quiz or exam for regrading, without the instructor's knowledge and consent
- Giving or receiving unpermitted aid on a take-home examination
- Representing as one's own work the work of another
- Giving or receiving aid on an academic assignment under circumstances in which a reasonable person should have known that such aid was not permitted

In recent years, most student disciplinary cases have involved Honor Code violations; of these, the most frequent arise when a student submits another's work as his or her own, or gives or receives unpermitted aid. The standard penalty for a first offense includes a one-quarter suspension from the University and 40 hours of community service. In addition, most faculty members issue a "No Pass" or "No Credit" for the course in which the violation occurred. The standard penalty for a multiple violation (e.g. cheating more than once in the same course) is a three-quarter suspension and 40 or more hours of community service.

Honor Code - Interpretations

In the Spring of 1977, the Student Conduct Legislative Council authored and adopted the following guidelines to assist students and faculty in understanding their rights and obligations under the University's Honor Code. The most recent revisions to the original text were adopted in the Winter of 2002 by the Board on Judicial Affairs.

It must be understood that the individual and collective responsibility of the students for upholding the Honor Code was not imposed upon the students by the administration or the faculty but was assumed by the students at their own request starting in 1921. Without such student responsibility, the Honor Code cannot be effectively maintained.

1. GENERAL

- The Honor Code is agreed to by every student who registers at Stanford University and by every instructor who accepts an appointment.
- The Honor Code provides a standard of honesty and declares that compliance with that standard is to be expected. It does not contemplate that the standard will be self-enforcing but calls on students, faculty, and administration to encourage compliance and to take reasonable steps to discourage violations. If violations occur, procedures are prescribed by the Student Judicial Charter of 1997. However, the Honor Code depends for its effectiveness primarily on the individual and collective desire of all members of the community to prevent and deter violations rather than on proceedings to impose penalties after violations have occurred.
- In interpreting and applying the general provisions of the Honor Code, it should be kept in mind that although primary responsibility for making the Code effective rests with the students, faculty cooperation is essential, since the faculty sets the academic requirements which students are to meet. The faculty should endeavor to avoid academic requirements and procedures which place honorable and conscientious students at a disadvantage. The faculty should also be ready and willing to consult with students and should be responsive to their suggestions in these matters.
- While an instructor's failure to observe these guidelines might be viewed as an extenuating circumstance in evaluating penalty options for a student's misconduct, it would not preclude the initiation of an otherwise warranted charge against the student.

2. SPECIFIC INTERPRETATIONS AND APPLICATIONS

a) Third-party responsibility

A primary responsibility assumed by students is to discourage violations of the Honor Code by others. Various methods are possible. Drawing attention to a suspected violation may stop it. Moral suasion may be effective. Initiating formal procedures is a necessary and obligatory remedy when other methods are inappropriate or have failed. Faculty members have like responsibilities when suspected violations come to their attention.

b) Proctoring

Proctoring means being present in the examination room during a written examination, with the following exceptions:

1. The prohibition against proctoring should not be construed to prohibit an instructor or teaching assistant from remaining in the examination room for the first few minutes to distribute and explain the examination; or from visiting the examination room briefly to transmit additional information; or from returning at the end of the examination to collect examination papers.
2. Nor does the prohibition against proctoring prohibit an instructor or teaching assistant from visiting the examination room in response to specific reports from students that cheating has been observed, to investigate the basis for such reports.

The instructor or teaching assistant may also visit the examination room briefly and infrequently in order to answer students' questions.

c) Unusual and unreasonable precautions

In interpreting and applying this provision, consideration should be given to standard procedures which are customary to Stanford and the need for cooperation between students and faculty in making the Honor Code effective. The following situations are cited as examples:

An instructor should not require students to identify themselves before being admitted to an examination room, or require students to submit in advance to being searched for notes or other materials, or maintain surveillance upon students who leave the examination room. Nor should the instructor take deliberate steps to invite dishonesty in order to entrap students. Procedures of this kind would be unusual and unreasonable.

On the other hand, an instructor may require copies of an examination or test to be returned after the examination. When possible, alternate seating should be provided and used for all examinations. To avoid controversy in any rereading or regrading of students' work, the instructor may take measures by which the original work may be clearly identified. With clear advance notice, an instructor may systematically compare work submitted to current or previous submissions. An instructor who requires students to make up a missed test or examination may administer a different test or examination of equivalent range and difficulty. Such procedures are not to be construed as unusual or unreasonable.

d) Procedures that create temptations to violate the Honor Code

Although students are expected to resist temptations to cheat, the faculty should endeavor to minimize inducements to dishonesty. Examples of undesirable procedures include the following: failure to give clear directions and instructions concerning course requirements and the limits of acceptable collaboration in coursework; treating required work casually as if it were unimportant; carelessness or inconsistency in maintaining security of examinations or tests; reusing an examination which is neither kept secure from public exposure nor made available to all students. If take-home examinations are given, they should not be closed-book examinations, nor should there be a specific time limit less than the full period between the distribution of the examination and its due date. Such procedures place honorable and conscientious students in a difficult position and often at a disadvantage, and could be interpreted as mitigating by a judicial panel.

e) Penalty grading

Students are not to be penalized for violations of the Honor Code without adjudication under the procedures specified by the Student Judicial Charter of 1997. An instructor may not, therefore, lower a student's grade or impose any other academic penalty on the grounds of dishonesty in the absence of such formal proceedings.

f) Instructor Discretion

Procedures falling under instructor discretion would include exam location, alternate times for exams, and alteration of due dates. Tests will be taken from the classroom only with the consent of the instructor.

g) Basis of Grading

All student work in a course or independent study (exams, quizzes, problem sets, drafts of papers, oral presentations, internet/websites, research, classroom discussions, etc.) forms the basis for evaluating and/or grading. The Honor Code applies to all academic work whether or not the work is given a letter grade, and whether or not the Honor Code is cited and/or signed. Therefore, regardless of the nature or extent of an assignment, academic dishonesty of any type is expressly prohibited and should always be considered a violation of the Honor Code.

h) Dual Submission Policy

One of the principal motivations behind the Honor Code is to prevent one student from taking unfair advantage over the other students in a class. For example, receiving unpermitted aid on an assignment or consulting notes on a closed book exam gives a student an advantage that students who adhere to the Honor Code do not have. In much the same way, submitting the same work in more than one course without the knowledge of the instructor undermines fairness because faculty assume that student work prepared for a course is done for that course alone. To this end, the Interpretations of the Stanford Honor Code shall include the following:

No student may submit substantially similar work in more than one class without the approval of any instructors who might otherwise assume that the work has been undertaken in their classes alone. Thus, submitting work that was prepared for a previous class requires the approval of the current instructor. Submitting substantially similar work in concurrent classes requires approval, in advance, from each instructor.

(Fall 2002)