

Analysis and Summary of Honor Committee Reporting Statistics

Kate McDaniel – CLAS 2018

University of Virginia

August 30, 2015

Purpose

The purpose of this project was to evaluate reporting data collected by the Honor Committee from 2008-2015. Due to differing collection practices and missing data, the analysis focused on data from 2011-2015. This leaves roughly two years of data before and after the implementation of the Informed Retraction (IR), which was added to the Honor Committee Bylaws on March 3, 2013. It is important to remember that small sample sizes and occasional missing data affect these results. Additionally, while the Informed Retraction was an important step for the Honor Committee and the University of Virginia, no concrete conclusions can be made about why any aspect of reporting changed with respect to the IR, as there are too many confounding variables.

Scope

The scope of this project included reporting statistics from 2011-2015. Using the reporting date from the first case reported in 2011 and the first case reported right after bylaw change, this left data from 771 days before the IR and 758 days after the IR. Only completed cases were evaluated.¹ Additionally, cases that initially began as one case but eventually were split into multiple trials were counted as multiple cases, depending on the number of trials that occurred. Re-trials from granted appeals were not counted as additional cases. With these restrictions, data from 84 cases before the IR and 90 cases after the IR remained. It is important to note that reports with regards to group projects are not counted as one case with multiple students, but rather as individual cases that are connected.

¹ One case, which was believed to be completed at the time the analysis, but is now in the appeal process, is included in the analysis. The two summer 2015 trials were also included in the analysis.

Data

To gauge the scope of reporting to the Honor System, the number of total reports made per year and the outcomes of each case were compared to the student population of the University in that year. As a continuation of this analysis, appeal outcomes were evaluated. Eight other criteria were also assessed and compared among each other. The eight initial categories were: Number of IRs taken, Year, School, Offense, Multiple Offenses, Reporter, Reporter School, and Reporter Department (if in the College of Arts and Sciences).

Graduate students not in a school for solely graduates (e.g. graduates in the College of Arts and Sciences) were counted within their school's numbers. Due to the data available, graduate students were not divided by year, but grouped under the category "Grad."

Data was analyzed by calendar year, not by academic year. This was due to the collection practices of the earlier years in addition to generally simplifying the process. Analysis focused on data comparisons before and after the IR. With this, 2013 was split into two sections, as the IR bylaw change occurred in March. Because of this, averages per year were first determined by month and then multiplied by 12.

Unless otherwise marked, the "Before IR" data is between 2011-2013. While data in the *Appendix* includes some data from 2008-2011, it was not typically part of the sum or averages of the "Before IR" data. The fields highlighted in red signify the greater number when the two tables are compared. The fields highlighted in blue mean there was no data (either due to no reporting or missing data) for that category.

Number of Total Reports vs. Population Size

In this analysis, the population size was the average of the two academic year populations that contained that year. For example, the 2014 population size was an average of the student

population at the University in 2013-2014 and 2014-2015. For 2015, the 2014-2015 population was used as the 2015-2016 data has not been published. The numbers were obtained from the Common Data Sets published by the Office of Institutional Assessment and Studies at the University (“Common Data Set”).

Between 2011-2015, no more than 0.22% of the student population as reported in a single year. Going back to 2008, 2010 had the highest percentage of reporting with 0.23% of the student population being reported. After the IR, the average percentage of students found guilty per year out of the total student population was 0.01%, down from 0.04% before the IR.²

The percentage of the student population found guilty in a single year from 2011-2015 didn’t exceed 0.02% (2014), with the exception of 2012, in which 0.07% of the student population was found guilty at a hearing that year. This was clearly an outlier in the data, with 16 guilty verdicts that year. The next highest year regarding guilty verdicts at hearings was 2014, with four. With the exception of 2012, there were always more cases dropped than found guilty at a hearing.

On average, after the IR, there were a higher number of reports, with a higher percentage of the student population being reported. Even with higher reporting, there was a lower total number and percentage of the total student population going to a hearing, and being found guilty at a hearing. Additionally, more cases were dropped on average after the IR. While there is a change in reporting before and after the IR it is important to keep in mind the small sample sizes and the fact that there are many confounding factors in reporting to Honor that cannot possibly be controlled for. As this data is fairly extensive, it can be found in the Appendix.

² This number was calculated using the average number of guilty verdicts per year and the average population of the years involved (e.g. the average population from 2013, 2014, and 2015 for calculations After the IR).

These statistics clearly demonstrate that there are many Honor Offenses that occur that are not reported. While it cannot be determined whether this is due to lack of knowledge of the offense or not, it would be unrealistic to assume that less than 0.25% of the student population commits an Honor Offense every year.

In a 2012 survey of 1,712 members of the student population, 4.73% reported that they believed that they had committed an Honor Offense while at the University, while 12.09% reported that they “maybe” had (“Honor Survey 2012” 6). In a Fall 2014 study of 531 diverse undergraduate and graduate students, 14.3% reported that they had committed an Honor Offense (Jacoby, Melton, Ochs, and Whitley 18). There was no “maybe” option on the Fall 2014 study. While these numbers are much lower than those of other Universities with Honor Codes (ranging from a self-reported 54% to 7% depending on the offense) (McCabe, Treviño, and Butterfield 223-224), it is still much higher than the percentage of students being reported.

Outcomes vs. Number of Cases Reported

On average after the IR, only 6.67% of cases reported were found guilty at a hearing, down from 23.81% of cases before the IR. This is with an *increase* of approximately 3 (2.77) cases being reported per year after the IR. The percentage of cases reported per year being dropped also increases after the IR, with 23.33% being dropped compared to 19.05% before the IR. Not guilty outcomes are the highest percentage of outcomes with 26.67% after the IR and 28.57% before the IR. The total number of hearings after the IR, not counting appeal trials, dropped from an average of 20.31 hearings before the IR to an average of 13.85 after. On average, 22.22% of cases reported per year after the IR end with the student taking the IR. This is between one in four and one in five cases. This data is included with population data in the Appendix.

Appeal Outcomes

Before the IR, all students who were granted appeals were found guilty at another hearing. This includes one case in which two appeals were granted and both additional hearings ended in a guilty verdict. There has only been one granted appeal after the IR, for which the outcome is unknown. On average, there were only 0.46 granted appeals per year after the IR, while there were 1.85 granted appeals on average per year before the IR. Appeal outcome tables are found in the Appendix.

Year

On average, 41.51 cases were reported per year after the IR went into effect, while 38.77 cases were reported before. The number of reported graduate students, fourth-years, second-years, and first-years all increased, while the number of reported third-years decreased. Even with the decrease, third-years were the most reported class before and after the IR. Both before and after the IR there have been no alumnae reported, while one non-degree student was reported after March of 2013. Before the IR, 10.71% of the data is unknown, while after the IR there is no missing data.

Average Number of Reports per Year by Year of Student

Before IR		
Year	Number	Percentages
Grad	3.23	8.33
4	6.92	17.86
3	13.38	34.52
2	6.92	17.86
1	4.15	10.71
Alumnus	0.00	0.00
Non-Degree	0.00	0.00
Unknown	4.15	10.71
Total	38.77	100.00

After IR		
Year	Number	Percentages
Grad	3.69	8.89
4	11.08	26.67
3	12.92	31.11
2	7.38	17.78
1	6.00	14.44
Alumnus	0.00	0.00
Non-Degree	0.46	1.11
Unknown	0.00	0.00
Total	41.54	100.00

School Of Enrollment

After the IR, reporting of students in the College of Arts and Sciences (CLAS), the Curry School of Education (EDUC), the School of Medicine (MED), and the School of Continuing and Professional Studies (SCPS) increased. All other schools had a decrease in reporting with the exception of Darden Business School (GBUS), the Law School (LAW), the Batten School of Public Policy (BATT), and Semester at Sea (SAS), where there were no reports after the IR was passed. Before the IR was created, there were no reports from CURRY, MED, SCPS, nor SAS. All of the data from after the IR was complete, while 2.38% of the data from before the IR was missing. It is important to remember that not all cases reported in 2015 were counted in the analysis, but only the ones that were completed at the start of the analysis in early June.

Average Number of Reports per Year by School of Enrollment

Before IR		
School	Number	Percentages
CLAS	19.38	50.00
SEAS	6.00	15.48
SARC	0.46	1.19
EDUC	0.00	0.00
COMM	6.00	15.48
GBUS	3.23	8.33
LAW	1.38	3.57
MED	0.00	0.00
SCPS	0.00	0.00
NURS	0.92	2.38
BATT	0.46	1.19
SAS	0.00	0.00
Unknown	0.92	2.38
Total	38.77	100.00

After IR		
School	Number	Percentages
CLAS	25.38	61.11
SEAS	5.08	12.22
SARC	0.46	1.11
EDUC	1.38	3.33
COMM	5.54	13.33
GBUS	0.00	0.00
LAW	0.00	0.00
MED	0.46	1.11
SCPS	2.77	6.67
NURS	0.46	1.11
BATT	0.00	0.00
SAS	0.00	0.00
Unknown	0.00	0.00
Total	41.54	100.00

Offense

Reporting of Lying and Stealing, and reports with a combination of offenses increased after the IR. Before the IR, there were no reports for a combination of offenses. The number of total reports differs from the other comparisons here because of combination offenses. For example, if one report included lying and stealing, it was counted as two offenses. There was no data missing from the period after the IR, while 2.38% of data was missing from the period before the IR.

Average Number of Reports per Year by Offense

Before IR			After IR		
Offense	Number	Percentages	Offense	Number	Percentages
Lying	2.31	5.95	Lying	9.23	21.28
Cheating	32.77	84.52	Cheating	30.92	71.28
Stealing	2.77	7.14	Stealing	3.23	7.45
Combination	0.00	0.00	Combination	1.85	4.26
Unknown	0.92	2.38	Unknown	0.00	0.00
Total	38.77	100.00	Total	43.38	100.00

Multiple Offenses

The criterion of Multiple Offenses was not recorded before the IR went into effect as it came about as a result of the Nexus of Events created by the IR. Of the cases after the IR, 24.44% of reports included multiple offenses with 75.56% of reports only covering one offense.

Average Number of Reports per Year by Multiple Offenses

Before IR			After IR		
Multiple Offenses	Number	Percentages	Multiple Offenses	Number	Percentages
Yes	0.00	0.00	Yes	10.15	24.44
No	0.00	0.00	No	31.38	75.56
Before IR	38.77	100.00	Before IR	0.00	0.00
Total	38.77	100.00	Total	41.54	100.00

Multiple Offense Outcomes

Multiple offense reports were only recorded after the IR went into effect as they are relevant to whether or not a student can take an IR for all offenses reported or not. As of the end of the reports included in the analysis, there were no multiple offense reports in 2015. There were 12 multiple offense reports in 2014, and 10 in 2013 after the IR went into effect. The number of offenses was not always recorded, and, therefore, no analysis could be done on all of the data. On average, half of these cases were found not guilty, with the next most likely outcome being guilty (27.27%). At 13.64%, the third most likely outcome was to Leave Admitting Guilt (LAG), with only 4.55% of multiple offense cases being dropped. These were the only four outcomes of multiple offense cases.

Outcomes of Multiple Offense Cases

Outcome	Number	Percentages
Drop	0.46	4.55
Exec Drop	0.00	0.00
IR	0.46	4.55
Dismissed	0.00	0.00
LAG	1.38	13.64
Guilty	2.77	27.27
Not Guilty	5.08	50.00
CMD	0.00	0.00
Unknown	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	10.15	100.00

Reporter

Faculty consistently reported the most with an average of 18.92 reports per year before the IR and 24.00 reports per year after the IR. Students are the next most frequent reporter with an average of 10.62 reports per year before the IR and 8.77 reports per year after the IR.

After the IR, there was an increase in reports from administration, faculty, and “Other” (e.g. a report from a community member), while reports from TAs and students decreased. There were no reports from members of the administration before the IR. All of the data after the IR was available, while 2.38% of the data from before the IR was unknown.

Average Number of Reports per Year by Reporter

Before IR			After IR		
Reporter	Number	Percentages	Reporter	Number	Percentages
Administration	0.00	0.00	Administration	1.85	4.44
Faculty	18.92	48.81	Faculty	24.00	57.78
TA	6.46	16.67	TA	3.23	7.78
Student	10.62	27.38	Student	8.77	21.11
Other	1.85	4.76	Other	3.69	8.89
Unknown	0.92	2.38	Unknown	0.00	0.00
Total	38.77	100.00	Total	41.54	100.00

Reporter School

After the IR, reporters from CLAS, SEAS, the School of Architecture (SARC), and the School of Nursing (NURS) increased. Reporters from EDUC, SCPS, and the McIntire School of Commerce (COMM) decreased. There were no reports from GBUS, LAW, or MED after the IR. Before the IR, there were no reports from SARC, MED, nor NURS. The College had the most reporting by far with an average of 13.38 per year before the IR and 19.38 per year after the IR. It is important to remember that not all cases reported in 2015 were counted in the analysis, but only the ones that were completed at the start of the analysis in early June.

Average Number of Reports per Year by Reporter School

Before IR			After IR		
Reporter School	Number	Percentages	Reporter School	Number	Percentages
CLAS	13.38	34.52	CLAS	19.38	46.67
SEAS	5.54	14.29	SEAS	6.92	16.67
SARC	0.00	0.00	SARC	0.92	2.22
EDUC	0.46	1.19	EDUC	0.46	1.11
COMM	6.00	15.48	COMM	5.54	13.33
GBUS	3.23	8.33	GBUS	0.00	0.00
LAW	1.38	3.57	LAW	0.00	0.00
MED	0.00	0.00	MED	0.00	0.00
SCPS	0.92	2.38	SCPS	0.92	2.22
NURS	0.00	0.00	NURS	0.46	1.11
Other	1.38	3.57	Other	3.69	8.89
Unknown	6.46	16.67	Unknown	3.23	7.78
Total	38.77	100.00	Total	41.54	100.00

Reporter Department in the College of Arts and Sciences

The department of the reporter was evaluated when the reporter was from the College of Arts and Sciences. As there was no standard practice, the department of the reporter was not always recorded. Additionally, only the departments that were reported were evaluated.

Reporting from the Economics, Statistics, Psychology, Chemistry, Politics, Music, Astronomy and Mathematics department increased after the IR. Additionally, there was an increase in the number of reports from the Operations Department of the College. There was a decrease in reporting in the Biology, History, and English departments after the IR. Furthermore, there were no reports after the IR from the Environmental Science, Government and Classics departments.

Before the IR, there were no reports from the Chemistry, Politics, Music, Astronomy, Mathematics, and Classics Departments. There were also no reports from the Operations Department.

This data must be evaluated carefully as 34.38% of the data from before the IR was unknown and 14.29% of the data from after the IR was unknown. Data is included in the appendix due to the size of the table.

Informed Retraction Data

Data on the IR was taken regarding the number of IRs taken, in addition to the number of IRs taken per year and by offense. From the start of the IR to the start of the time period of this study (June 2015), 20 IRs were taken. It is important to keep in mind that this study only evaluated cases that were completed by the start of the study. Other cases and IRs have been since taken in 2015 that were not included in this data. This analysis only includes four reports from 2015 – the cases that were completed at the time this analysis began. On average, 9.23 IRs were taken per year after the IR went into effect.

IR by Year

The analysis of the number of IRs taken per year by Year of Student also includes data on the number of cases that ended with another outcome. The other outcomes are not specified, but include all cases in which the student did not take an IR. If the student took an IR and then went through the trial process for other charges, the final outcome of other charges that went forward were the ones taken into account.

There were only two cases in which students took an IR and continued with the trial process. One was found guilty at a hearing and one left the University admitting guilt (LAG). There was a third case in which a student at a hearing had already taken an IR, but the case at the hearing and the IR taken dealt with two separate reports, and, therefore, the student was not eligible to take an IR for the report that continued to a hearing.

One thing that must be considered is the number of students reported for multiple similar offenses that would have taken the IR if the offenses were considered in the same Nexus of Events. Often, these students do not take an IR and continue to a hearing for all of the offenses. There is no way to quantify these students as this is a hypothetical situation, but it is one that gets brought up frequently when discussing the Informed Retraction and possible by-law changes.

Third year students took the largest total number of IRs, while fourth year students took the most IRs compared to the total number of fourth-year students reported. Due to the size of the table, the data is included in the Appendix.

IR by Offense

Students who were reported for cheating took the highest number of IRs per year, followed by reports of Lying and then Stealing. Since March 2013, only one IR has been taken for a report of multiple offenses, in which case the two offenses fell within the same Nexus of Events. These statistics may be misleading since some students who are reported for multiple offenses do not have the opportunity to take the IR for all offenses reported. As shown by the multiple offense cases, there were many students who did not have the option to take the IR for all offenses in their case, even if the multiple offenses were committed under the same circumstances. Not including the combination offenses, students who were reported for cheating were most likely to take the IR, followed by reports of Lying, and then reports of Stealing. This chart is in the Appendix due to size.

Timeline

The length of time it takes to complete a case was evaluated with regards to all reports, with and without CMD cases included, and with and without cases reported at the end of the semester included. Cases that were included as “end of semester” cases were ones reported in the

month of December, and from April 16th – August 15th as these cases often aren't attended to in the same timeframe as other cases, as the University is either nearing extended holidays or not in regular session. Cases that included CMDs were not included in the “End of Semester” numbers. The fields highlighted in red represent the higher number when comparing the two tables.

With all data included, it took an average of 112.81 days to process a case to completion after the IR, while it took 126.44 days before the IR. With the exception of cases reported in the “end of semester” time frame, cases were processed quicker in every field after the IR with 16.95% of data missing from before the IR and 26.34% of data missing after the IR.

Implementation of the IR could have affected case processing in two ways. First, it would significantly shorten the length of cases in which students chose to take the IR. Secondly, it could extend cases in which students chose not to take the IR, as there is now a seven-day period where the investigation pauses for students to contemplate their options. It is not clear how either of these changes affects the timeline of the case directly. It is also important to consider that while improvements could definitely be made to how quickly cases are processed on the end of the Honor Committee, much of the initial investigation hinges on when the reported student and other witnesses are available for interviews.

Length of Cases Before the IR

Average Number of Days	126.44
Without CMD (Days)	102.49
Only CMD (Days)	236.71
Without End of Semester (Days)	89.86
Only End of Semester (Days)	102.00
Total % Unknown Data	16.95

Length of Cases After the IR

Average Number of Days	112.81
Without CMD (Days)	95.07
Only CMD (Days)	200.17
Without End of Semester (Days)	73.85
Only End of Semester (Days)	104.59
Total % Unknown Data	26.34

Education and Outreach Suggestions

To start, it is important to remember that not all cases of lying, cheating, or stealing are reported to the Honor Committee. Some departments and schools have higher number of reports than most. While zero reports due to zero occurrences of Honor Offenses would be the most ideal scenario, it also must be understood that offenses may have occurred and may not have been reported. The University as a whole could benefit from more education about Honor, if not for the sole purpose of further understanding the process and culture at the University. These education efforts are aimed at the information revealed by this analysis, but could be applied to any department or subsection of students or faculty at the University. Additionally, it is important to take into account all of the factors that go into reporting – differences in reporting before and after the IR cannot solely be attributed to the by-law change. While there are differences in the numbers assessed, there are too many confounding factors that contribute to reporting to the Honor Committee that cannot be controlled for.

Perception

There is a perception among some students at the University that Honor is a large governing force that expels students on a regular basis – that there is the “invisible hand of Honor” that ubiquitously watches students and helps to control the University. As shown by the data on reporting compared to the total student population, this is clearly untrue. Even in 2012, the year with the most reporting, less than one tenth of a percent of the student population was found guilty at a trial, while, from 2008-2015, no more than 0.23% of the student population has been reported in a year – less than one quarter of a percentage point.

With education efforts in the fall, both the traditional efforts and efforts in response to the referenda proposed in the Spring of 2015, this data will be vital in giving students information to

form new and well-informed perceptions of Honor. Both the data dealing with reports, etc. compared to student population, and the data containing other, more specific analysis can be used to change perception in a way that students can form up-to-date opinions on Honor based on the most recent and correct information.

Basic education efforts can include a version of the “Honor Cheat Sheet” with the most recent statistics and contact information – an alternative to the definitions sheet that Honor hands out currently. The spin wheel can also be updated to include questions asking about statistics, such as “What percentage of the total student population do you think are reported to Honor every year?” or “What percentage of the total student population do you think are found guilty at hearings?”. This will present an opportunity for Honor representatives to hear the thoughts and opinions of students along with the opportunity to make sure they have the most recent information. Questions like this are not limited to the spin-wheel, but can also be used to start presentations and gauge the audience’s perception of Honor so that the presentation and information is best suited to what they understand and want to know. These initiatives are especially important with regards to the referenda specific education in the fall and during election season in the spring.

While student perception is vital to the system, as the Honor Committee is solely student run and only students are processed through the system, Professor perception of the System is important to its survival. Faculty, compared to other demographics, report most frequently to the Committee, and therefore, play a crucial role in upholding the ideal. While some professors do report to the system, sometimes with shocking regularity, many deal with Honor Offenses internally, with the Committee never finding out about such occurrences. Additionally, McCabe, Treviño and Butterfield found that when students realized that certain professors didn’t enforce a

code of academic honesty, word spread and students tended to take advantage of those professors (226). This shows that professor perception is important in not only enforcing the system, but also in forming student's perception and tendency to abide by the system.

Recruitment³

Possibly one of the most effective ways to increase knowledge about Honor with the general student population is to increase the diversity of the Support Officer pool. While it is important to recruit from the general population, it could be helpful to focus additional recruitment efforts in schools with low reporting and departments with unusually high reporting. With students from these schools and/or departments, either in the Support Officer pool or the Honor General Body (an educator pool), there will be a higher chance that students in these schools or departments will know someone in Honor and have a more comfortable resource to go to if they have any questions. Additionally, students in these schools or departments will be resources for professors if they have any questions and will be able to encourage education efforts and more general awareness within those classes.

Hopefully, with increased recruitment and participation in Honor from these departments there will be a decrease in instances of Honor Offenses and reporting in these schools and departments. Additionally, with Support Officers from these departments, it will be easier to process cases with nuances in material that the average student or Support Officer wouldn't necessarily understand. While the cases can be, and have been, processed without these Support Officers, Support Officers with background in these schools and/or departments would be more likely to think of or pick up on evidence that might otherwise be thought of as unremarkable.

³ Thanks to Alex Carroll for this idea.

Informed Retraction Reform

With possible changes coming to the Informed Retraction, this analysis can be used to inform the decision and/or to help decide between multiple options of reform. One of the integral findings was that two students have been caught in the Nexus of Events in such a way that they took an IR for one offense and continued through the process with other offenses reported at the same time. One of these students LAGed while the other was found guilty at a trial. While these numbers are smaller than the perception that is commonly held within Honor, students who would have taken an IR for multiple offense reports, but did not due to the other offenses proceeding regardless, need to be thought of. While there is no way to quantify these students, they are an important part of the process when considering the options for reform. Additionally, while two is not that big of a number, it is still large when considering the impact that LAGing or the single sanction has had on their University career. A widening of the Nexus of Events to include multiple events that happened under the same circumstance, such as using an unauthorized resource on multiple homework assignments within one class, would have given these students a chance to take an Informed Retraction and eventually return to the University.

Education Focused by Year

At the beginning of the fall Semester, first-year students often go to convocation and learn about Honor and its history at the University. In addition to lawn chats and convocation, Honor also has many education efforts that are focused specifically at first-years throughout the year, such as First Year S'mores during finals. Out of the undergraduate students, the Honor Committee receives the least number of reports regarding first-year students. While this could be due to a number of factors, not solely more focused education efforts, more focused and renewed

education efforts could benefit the other years. Both before and after the IR, the Committee received more reports of third-year students than any other year, including graduate students.

If Class Council or another similar group organizes a start of the year event for third-years and Honor is allowed to present, a short speech or booth about Honor could be beneficial. While third-year students may not need the same level of detail as first-year students, Honor's presence could possibly be beneficial in reminding the students of their responsibilities to themselves and the Community of Trust.

Schools with Low Reporting

There were no reports of Medical School students before the IR and less than one report per year (0.46 reports per year) after the IR. Additionally, there have been very few students reported from the School of Architecture, the School of Nursing, the Frank Batten School of Public Policy, the Darden School of Business, and the Law School. A public forum event to get input from these schools about their practices and culture regarding Honor could possibly give ideas regarding how to foster a stronger culture of Honor in other Schools, as well as being informative to the Committee in general.

Economics Reporting

Both before and after the creation of the IR, the Economics Department of the College of Arts and Sciences had the most number of reports, with 3.23 reports on average per year before the IR, and 6.00 reports on average per year after the IR. The next highest number of reports before the IR was 0.92 on average per year (in the Biology, Psychology, History, English, and Environmental Sciences departments), while after the IR, the next highest number of reports was 1.85 on average per year from the Statistics Department.

It is clear that there need to be more focused education efforts for the Economics Department. While students are the ones being reported, professors and TAs could probably benefit from education efforts as well.

Starting with Professors and TAs, and open forum event to allow discussion of ideas and topics concern would be a great start. With this, the Honor Committee and Support Officers could help to provide the specific support that the department needs – needs that the Committee might not even be aware of yet. During this event, a syllabus review might be helpful to ensure that the syllabus is clear from a student perspective. With these, it could be helpful to ask the professors to outline exactly what is and isn't okay for their class – more in-depth than what a syllabus would usually have. With more in-depth information, hopefully it would become clearer to students where the boundaries are for their specific class. Additionally, encouraging professors and TAs to speak to Honor at the beginning of the semester and to be open to questions about their Honor policies before and after class, and during office hours could possibly give students an outlet to ensure that their work is Honorable.

With student education, it is important to make sure that they don't feel like they are being spotlighted or attacked. One clear way that the Committee can educate students is to have a Committee or Support Officer representative speak at the beginning of the semester to every big lecture, or even small Economics class, with the Professor's permission. It will be important to make sure that the students know their resources for finding out more about Honor, as well as their resources regarding Conscientious Retractions, Informed Retractions, and the general Honor process. While free pens and mugs make Honor somewhat tangible to students, it is also imperative to make sure they understand the gravity of Honor at the University and how they personally contribute to the Community of Trust. Information from this analysis about reporting

to Honor at the University and the frequency of various case outcomes could be helpful in educating students about the current status of Honor at the University.

While these education efforts would be best spent targeted at the Economics Department, they could also be helpful to approach other departments, such as Statistics, or speak to the Faculty Advisory Committee to determine if any other departments would like Honor to speak to their professors, TAs, or classes at the beginning of the semester.

General Outreach

While education efforts, both specifically and in general are important, regular outreach efforts could be the most crucial in ensuring that Professors, TAs, and students keep Honor in the back of their minds. Tabling, speaking to lecture halls, attending large student events, co-sponsoring events, helping other CIOs, and speaking to students and faculty personally about Honor all play a crucial role in ensuring that Honor is accessible to all Professors, TAs, and students at the University.

Acknowledgements

A special thanks to the Honor Committee for making this report possible and to Alex Carroll for her help every step of the way. Additional thanks to my father for helping me make sense of the data.

Works Cited

"Common Data Set." *Common Data Set: Institutional Assessment and Studies, University of Virginia*. Office of Institutional Assessment and Studies at the University of Virginia.

Web. 11 Aug. 2015. <<http://avillage.web.virginia.edu/iaas/cds/cds.shtm>>.

"Honor Survey 2012." Online interview.

Jacoby, Albert, Theresa Melton, Laura Ochs, and Sarah E. Whitley. "Attitudes, Perceptions, and Practices of Honor at the University of Virginia." (2014). Print.

McCabe, Donald L., Linda Klebe Treviño, and Kenneth D. Butterfield. "Cheating in Academic Institutions: A Decade of Research." *Ethics & Behavior* 11.3 (2001): 219-32. Print.

MLA formatting by BibMe.org.