

# Honor System Review Committee

Update for CPUC  
26 March 2018

# Honor System Review Committee (HSRC)

- Charge: examine aspects of the Honor Committee
  - Investigation and hearing processes and policies
  - Honor Constitution language and academic integrity standards
  - Penalties
  - Honor Committee membership, and the relationship with USG
  - USG December 2017 referenda
  - Faculty advisory committee to the Honor Committee
    - Omid Abrishamchian '18
    - Carolyn E. Liziewski '18
- Membership: students and faculty
  - Demetrius August (CUE)
  - Morales Nunez '18
  - Rebecca D. Burdine (MOL)
  - Ling Ritter '19
  - Janet Y. Chen (HIS)
  - Clarence W. Rowley III '95 (MAE)
  - Patrick H. Flanigan '18
  - Anna M. Shields (EAS)
  - William A. Gleason (ENG)
  - Joyce Chen Shueh (ODUS)
  - Michael S. Graziano (PSY)
  - Cecily H. Swanson (Mathey college)
  - Elizabeth C. Haile '19
  - Jasmine G. Young '20



## Work to date

- Weekly meetings since January
- To date, focus has been on USG referenda
- We have written a report our preliminary recommendations, to be discussed at the Committee on Examinations and Standing's meeting on April 11
- A summary of our recommendations is online:  
<http://hcreview.princeton.edu>



# Referendum 1: penalties

- Background
  - In-class examinations are handled by the Honor Committee. All other work (e.g., take-home examinations) is handled by the Committee on Discipline.
  - Presently, the usual penalty for copying someone else's work is a one-year suspension; for "overtime" violations, academic probation
  - The referendum would make academic probation the "standard penalty" for all of these violations of in-class exams.
- Recommendation
  - The HSRC is not yet ready to make recommendations about penalties, but will make recommendations in our full report at the end of the semester.
  - We do not recommend adoption of this referendum, because of the disparity it creates between the Honor Committee and the Committee on Discipline.



# Referendum 2: Evidence

- The referendum would add the following text to the Honor Constitution:

A case brought to hearing must have at least two separate pieces of evidence, each of which indicates that a violation occurred.

- This is aligned with current practice of the Honor Committee.
- We can imagine situations in which there is only one piece of evidence, but it is so compelling that the case should move forward to a hearing (e.g., “doctored regrade”).

- Recommendation

- We do not recommend adoption of this referendum, but we unanimously support the following revised amendment:  
A case will not move forward to hearing on the basis of testimony from one witness in the absence of additional evidence substantiating the alleged violation.



# Referendum 3: Faculty involvement

- The referendum would amend the Honor Constitution as follows:
  - A student will be found not responsible ... if the course instructor explicitly states that a student's actions were not in violation of their class policy.
- Goal: ensure Honor Committee does not disregard an instructor's testimony, especially regarding overtime violations.
- Difficulty: it amounts to a "professor veto", which has a number of undesirable effects:
  - Harms consistency and centrality of the disciplinary process
  - Process is no longer student-run
  - A single individual has ultimate control over the process

## Recommendation

- We recommend against adoption of this referendum

- We will continue to think about how to best address the issue of



## Next steps

- The HSRC will continue to meet weekly for the rest of the semester
- The HSRC will release a full report of its recommendations at the end of the spring semester
- This full report will go to the Committee on Examinations and Standing, which will decide which recommendations from the preliminary and the full report will go to the full faculty for a vote
- Your input is welcome: [hcreview@princeton.edu](mailto:hcreview@princeton.edu)
- Visit our website: <http://hcreview.princeton.edu>

