



## **Faculty Survey on the UVa Honor System, 2006**

### **OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES**

**Prepared by:**

#### **THE CENTER FOR SURVEY RESEARCH**

**Thomas M. Guterbock, Ph.D.**  
*Director, Principal Investigator*

**Kate F. Wood, Ph.D.**  
*Senior Research Associate*

**Deborah L. Rexrode, M.A.**  
*Research Analyst*

#### **THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA HONOR COMMITTEE**

**Alison V. Tramba**  
*2006-2007 Honor Committee Chair*

**November 26, 2006**

*A project initiated by the  
2005-2006 Honor Committee:  
**J. David Hobbs, Chair***



Weldon Cooper  
Center for Public Service  
**University of Virginia**



**UVa Faculty Survey on the Honor System**  
**Responses to Open-ended Questions**

**Table of Contents by Question**

B10 .....	1
B16 .....	2
B21 .....	4
B24 .....	6
B26 .....	7
B28 .....	9
B29 .....	9
B30 .....	12
B35 .....	19
C2 .....	47
C3 .....	72
C5 .....	77
C6 .....	83
D6 .....	86
E1 .....	86
E2 .....	89
E3 .....	122
E4 .....	146



## OPEN-ENDED QUESTION RESPONSES

\*CSR has reviewed the responses to open-ended questions and removed any identifying comments. They are reproduced here essentially "verbatim."

**Q B10 Other: In the most recent instance, when you clearly observed a student intentionally cheating or been quite certain that a student cheated on work for your course, what action did you take?**

I offered the student the choice of taking a zero for the assignment or reporting the matter to the Honor Committee.
Discussed as cultural issue - international students were involved.
Student copied from the person sitting in the adjacent seat, but that person had a different version of the test (i.e., a different sequence of questions, so that the two versions' answer keys didn't match at all. By copying, the student failed the test.
Ongoing. Will discuss with the student. May proceed to Honor.
Early in the exam I caught a student leaning over to copy another student's exam, I asked the student to move to another seat, and I think that scared or embarrassed the student enough. The student did not look up after that, and never did it again.
I reported it to the professor, who said that he would take care of it.
I referred the matter to my school's internal committee which handles charges of academic misconduct. The committee and the associate dean recommended that the student be allowed to satisfy the course requirements by doing an independent study paper, which I supervised.
I talked to the student.
A graduate student TA brought charges.
I reported it to the student's dean and arranged for the dean to meet with the student and discuss the implications. I asked the dean to explain that I could report this to the Honor Committee and have the student kicked out of school, but instead, because I object to the finality of the single sanction policy, I wanted the student and dean to work out her own penalty (personal obligation in writing to me, to the dean and, on the student's own initiative, to her parents).
I personally talked to the students involved.
I discussed matter with the coach of these athletes, who promised me he would suspend them from the team for the semester.
I reported it to the professor, who did report the case to the Honor Committee. I was never involved after that point, so I assume it never went to trial (the student was subsequently suspended for other academic reasons anyway).
I told professor in charge, I just graded.
Since it was for homework, the professor in charge of the class thought that we should scare the students by notifying the whole class that we have found instances of cheating on the homework's. Then, he announced that while he won't say who it was by name, he will prosecute to the full extent of the honor sanctions if the students continue to cheat. We also failed those students in their homework, but only for those homework's.
The students ended up failing the final exam and the course anyway, despite the cheating.

Q: B16

**Q B16 Other: How many times in the past two years have you ever suspected that a student cheated on an exam or assignment? In the most recent instance, what action did you take?**

I redesigned my exam from take home to an in class exam.
Discussed it with the student's program director. Outcome was to have student take all subsequent exams in a separate room.
Tried to verify that the student had been cheating
On both occasions, after closer observation of submitted work and of the student's behavior, it became clear that cheating had not occurred.
I looked up the references to see if I could find plagiarized content. When I could not find incriminating evidence I spoke with the student, not educated in the US, about what parts caused me concern and why. I then required resubmission of the paper for many other corrections that were needed.
I didn't know the identity of the student, but I know that someone in the course borrowed someone else's assignment from a submission box. I discussed the incident with the group.
I told the student to keep his eyes on his own work
Discussed it with a student not in that class, without giving the offender's name.
Discussed it with the group of students and faculty involved.
Investigated to see if the student was cheating. Collected and assessed evidence.
Gave the students an opportunity to justify similarities before taking any further steps
This involved online multiple-choice answer quizzes that had not been randomized and last year's answers were apparently recycled. It was impossible to prove, though, so I stopped administering the quizzes and replaced them with homework.
Discussed as cultural issue since international students were involved
I was in an administrative position and the student was not in my course.
When it has been unclear, we've moved the student to the front row of the classroom, seated in front of the instructor.
I checked for available clues if my suspicions were reasonable (and I failed to find them).
The case concerned students who had been permitted to leave the exam room and take their tests in another room; their exam scripts looked suggestively alike and there was some evidence they might have gone online to get answers. The evidence was not clear enough in the end to act on but I personally resolved never to let students in large lecture courses take exams in any space other than exam room from now on.
I wondered about the originality of the draft of a paper, which was not the final draft. I made clear in my comments on that draft the expectations for originality and clearly citing other work relied on, and said I expected to see this fixed in the final draft, which would be graded.
Presented a scenario to the class and asked how they would handle it if such a thing were to happen in their own classroom (education class). Then I had students assess their own grade as appropriate or not.
I suspect plagiarism on papers fairly often, and check on the Internet, but without evidence and with other signs of the student's ability, I don't act on it.
Asked students to be sure that the work was their own.
I brought my suspicion to the attention of the professor since he had more access to information regarding grades and student behavior than I did.
Revised method for offering case studies so that not all students get same case.
Moved the student to a different location in the classroom.
I suspected that the student might have turned in a written assignment that she copied. I used a search engine to see if I could find evidence of this. I didn't and I concluded that the work must be hers.

Q: B16

I've only seen cheating during test taking. When I see a student that is obviously cheating (i.e. looking at around another student's exam) I have asked him or her to move to seat that is not close to anyone else.
I tried to find the source that I suspected the student had copied. When I wasn't able to find the source, I gave the student the benefit of a doubt.
Graded sharply.
Discussed it in class.
Changed policies on the final exam (the next test) for the whole class.
Saw him looking at another student's test in class. Verbally reminded class to keep eyes on own paper.
Learned from student indirectly that he had memorized large sections of text before the exam.
Lowered the student's score on that particular assignment.
I was a juror in a trial where a student was accused of cheating.
Reduced score on assignment for those who both had duplicative work and did not acknowledge collaboration with other students
Reminded the class regarding Honor Code and penalty for cheating, in hopes offenders would come forward and correct themselves. A few did, but not those I suspected!
Tried to stop the behavior while it was going on.
I determined that I was wrong.
Suspected plagiarism; checked references and the internet and found nothing.
Researched the work to ascertain cheating.
Gave a writing assignment, followed up sources, checked internet for similar prose, none found.
Made a copy of the suspicious work for later reference.
At the time I was a TA, I reported the offenses to the professor, and that professor talked to the students. Unfortunately that professor let the students know that I had accused them of cheating (4 papers were handed in with identical wording / writing - it was obvious they cheated). The students denied that they had cheated, the professor raised their grades and I got a severe backlash on my student evaluations.
After discussing it with my professor we made it behaviorally clear to the student (i.e. without actually saying anything to her) that we had seen her looking continually at her neighbor's paper. She left without turning in her exam.
Talked to the whole class, rearranged how the exams were given and added proctors.
Talked with the family.
I read an exam one day, forgot to log the grade, and later that day re-read the same exam. It seemed very similar to an exam I had already read that day. I looked through the exams I had read that day and concluded that there were not two similar exams - just my mistake in thinking that one exam was two different exams. It was my mistake.
Reported it to the primary faculty member in charge of the course.
Since I had no proof, I reemphasized to the whole class the importance of treating take-home exams like in class exams.
No proof at all.
Worked with the student to determine whether he understood the work submitted and the nature of plagiarism. Worked with the student to determine other events / demands / issues in his life that might have lead to his possibly taking a short cut, reiterated with student the parameters for acceptable work and plagiarism. Worked with the student to rectify the situation.
Context: a student's second paper appeared dramatically more sophisticated than the first. I wondered if the student had used outside sources without acknowledging them. But after re-reading the student's paper a couple of times, I felt my grounds for suspicion did not warrant

Q: B16

any action--and the paper turned out not to be as excellent as I had initially thought.
Reiterated the importance of the Honor Code to the entire class. While reviewing the subject assignment, I related the suspicious behavior, in generic terms, without identifying individual(s) involved, and noted the potential consequences.
Dropped the assignment from final average.
Discussed it with the faculty member instructing the course (I was acting as a teaching assistant).
Discussed it with the suspected student.
Checked the web for plagiarism.
It was an instance when I had two students give the same very strange, very wrong response to a question. Neither student struck me as the type who would cheat, although they may have studied together. I decided to monitor in the future to see if there were any other such resemblances, but I didn't find anything conclusive.
Discouraged looking at others while taking exams.
Checked to see if the suspicious papers were available on-line.

**Q B21: How would you describe the time-commitment required from you? (Asked only of those who have reported and considered the process time-consuming)**

Organizing evidence and dealing with counter arguments from the suspected students. Meeting with honor students to discuss the cases.
I had to spend too much time collecting evidence and putting it into a meaningful form for the jury, as well as too much time testifying for the pre-trial and trial. I should have just given the student a zero on the assignment.
Time involved is not justified by the results. I have reported flagrant violations in which students went unpunished. The system in its current form does not justify any time given to it.
The process of documenting the cheating involves a level of evidence gathering that is very time consuming. Based on past experience with the committee, I had to create a line-by-line comparison between the student's work and the original document, noting how many consecutive words were plagiarized.
The advisers were good students and did their best, but they are not professionals who have to deal with the consequences of their action or inaction. For example, during the course of the honor trial I was involved with, materials were lost, the advisers failed to contact potential witnesses in a timely manner, failed to follow up with those witnesses, etc. This left me having to do all of this or else risk a not-guilty verdict, which I felt would have reflected very badly on me given the weight of the evidence.
It took alot of time to gather all the evidence.
A few hours and an evening.
Not a problem...just time consuming. Meeting with advisor, assembling materials (the most time-consuming task), attending the trial, and so on.
It's not so much the time required to make the report or meet with honor representatives. It is the emotional investment in the process. I agonize over my decision to report an honor violation. It drains me.
I had to commit evening (late into the night) and weekend hours (most of one day) on two different occasions.
It took a substantial number of meetings and hearings over almost a year. Meetings were scheduled for the convenience of the accused student and the honor counsel, not mine. I was once expected to meet with defense counsel on three hours notice on a Sunday.
It required several meetings with honor advisors to review the case and then the pre-trial hearing followed by an all-day trial on a weekend.
First, a Sunday morning trial was cancelled with no notice. The following Sunday morning trial was excessively long.



Q: B21

Had to submit a written report and was interviewed twice.
I had repeated conversations (phone and email) with a Dean and with the Honor Committee reps, plus a lengthy interview in which the Honor reps took dictation on my narrative and then got things wrong. (I was forced to edit the narrative later.) Then the case just disappeared from the horizon. The student admitted lying about missing an exam and, as far as I know, nothing happened to him. So the time I invested seems to have been utterly wasted.
In my most recent honor trial there was an appeal and a retrial (this was before the two-year period you are asking about. The current case is still pending.)
I was informed very late that the case was going to trial and that my participation, on a Sunday morning, was expected. Then the trial was postponed, and again I was informed, this time in more timely fashion, that I would need to devote several hours on a Sunday to the case. That proved true.
Until I complained loudly about it, I was given very little notice of meetings, hearings and such. Essentially I was required to come at a moment's notice.
The two honor cases I brought were in my administrative capacity rather than teaching capacity. Both required an evening. One panel hearing lasted the better part of an evening.
I did not have time to attend the pre-trial, and I didn't attend it.
The time-commitment itself - in terms of the amount of actual physical work I put into the case, was not a problem per se. What was more of a problem for me was the emotional toll and the time spent thinking / worrying if I had done the right thing in reporting the student, knowing that they could be expelled from the University. The honor offense took place at the very end of the Spring semester. So I spent a lot of time over the summer thinking about the case. It was a high-pressure situation, knowing that a student could potentially be expelled for something I reported them for. When it was all over, I breathed a huge sigh of relief.
Time in seeking another professional's or colleagues input (analysis of papers).
Students are not good at pre-planning. Make too many last minute requests and expect professors to be available at a moment's notice.
Student advisors were slow to contact me and often requested a meeting the same day or within three days of contact. Knowing a deadline was fast approaching (the trial, for example) investigators contacted me three days before the trial via email. My impression was that student advisors and investigators (not all, one set of investigators was extremely helpful) were disorganized. These students did not seem to realize that a faculty member/TA might not be able to meet with them on such short notice or after normal business hours. The case also dragged on for a semester and a half, with little to no contact from my advisor, so I often had no idea of where things were in the process. Also, with the trial date set for over a month, investigators did not contact a colleague to inform him that he might need to attend the trial as a witness until 3-4 days before the trial, which I felt was very irresponsible.
My case is atypical in that a group of students is being reported, so the time-commitment is a few-fold greater than what is probably normal.
There are many steps involved in the process: asking student witnesses to write statements, meeting with the accused student, meeting with the honor advisors, and going to the trial. I do realize it's important, but I would rather just fail the student in the class and be done with it.
It can be time consuming to acquire all the necessary evidence. If, for example, I need to demonstrate two students had similar answers to a short-answer question <i>AND</i> their answers were uncommon, then I have to extract the answers to that short answer question from the exams of all students in the class. I think that's the only way to convince a jury. Said another way, it can take a long time to determine how best to educate a set of novices (members of the jury who haven't taken the course in question) so they can make an intelligent judgment call about the accused honor offense.
First you report the suspect honor case (an hour or so of questions). The initial trail (to determine if enough evidence went from 8 pm until midnight. The trial is scheduled for Sunday morning. I know this is when people can all convene, but I put in many hours in the

Q: B21

office and am a bit possessive about my family time. (This is ignoring the tremendous emotional turmoil associated with each one.)
The two trials I was involved in (one I initiated, one I did not) took roughly two full days each. One full day for the trial, and additional time for interviews, discussions with colleagues, and the iPanel.
Every step took a long time, from putting together the file of materials all the way through the trial. Hours required at every step.
Multiple interviews, trials, and in one case a long delay in investigating my case.
It is more than your first category, but I think time consuming might be a little more involved than I would describe it.
I had to meet at very inconvenient hours (late at night usually). One time I stayed very late for a meeting only to be told by e-mail at the last minute that the meeting was cancelled. I live relatively far away (40 miles) and did not appreciate having meetings at 9 pm. I also have small children. It wasn't the amount of time but the choice of times that were very inconvenient for me.
Time to meet with honor advisors, multiple times and time for trial.
Proceedings later at night and a Sunday trial were inconvenient for my family.
The students were not very accommodating with scheduling. It appeared that they did not review the materials I gave them because they asked questions that were clearly covered in those materials. The honor trial itself was time-consuming and not at a time convenient for me.
It was not a very pleasant experience to attend the trial. Given the fact that I believe the Honor Committee failed to judge the student I reported for cheating, I felt like I wasted my time.

**Q B24: How fairly were you treated? (Asked only of those who have reported a case)**

Honor advisees are always models of politeness and, insofar as their intense rule-consciousness permits, helpful. But between single sanction and the local student felicitation of the Honor System here as something very special (it's not: many institutions have MUCH better systems), their effectiveness is really quite limited.
The student investigators repeatedly suggested that plagiarism that was remarkably extensive might have been a result of me being unclear about what constitutes plagiarism in my class (I assign a chapter for students to read about it, I discuss it in class, and a definition appears on my syllabus).
As just mentioned, the advisers were helpful and did their best, but I felt that some of them considered it more of a game than the real trial with real consequences which it was.
My honor advisor and the counsel for the community were all kind, professional, and courteous, but the outcome of the case went with the accused because of the jury's unwillingness to convict without proof that students were sitting next to each other. I had no photographic evidence of where they were sitting and no student to testify they sat next to each other, but I felt the identical blue books were enough proof.
I had to sit at an honor trial and listen as my character was impugned by defense counsel for filing charges against a student who had copied his entire paper off the internet.
Everything was OK until the trial. The proceedings essentially put me on trial, not the accused student.
The defendant's counsel raised a wholly bogus racial angle.
It wasn't that I was disrespected or personally treated in an unfair manner. My problem is that the Honor Committee refused to bring a case to trial that I thought was a total no-brainer. If you were to line up 100 professors and present them with the evidence against the student in question, I would expect all 100 to conclude without hesitation that the student cheated. Yet the committee, in its wisdom, did not find sufficient evidence (i.e., more likely

Q: B24

than not) to bring the case to trial. I was flabbergasted. Clearly, the advertised standard of evidence was not applied in this particular case, so in this sense I feel that the argument I presented was not adequately or fairly assessed.
I gave the assignment, caught the student cheating (to my mind), and turned the student in, and I felt like at the trial the student's defense team sort of made it sound like I was somehow responsible for the cheating or like I had done or was doing something wrong. This seemed wrong to me, but this is my only complaint.
I think that the issue of seriousness was downplayed, so that a case of cheating on the final exam (which I thought was proven) was not thought to be serious enough to merit expulsion. That did not seem fair to me.
I was treated okay. It was clear though, that when it came down to my word against the student's word, the committee chose not to believe me, and to believe my student instead. That was extremely frustrating. I knew the student in question had cheated - there was no doubt in my mind.
My colleague's support was not received.
The issue wasn't fairness - it was that the student lawyers, especially on the defendant's side, were not equipped to handle the case. I ended up having to defend the student and redirecting the trial away from things that were damaging to the student but completely irrelevant to the case. The defendant's lawyer also asked me during the trial to read parts of a paper of his for submission to a class I wasn't teaching but that related to my area of expertise - this struck me as really inappropriate and on some ethereal level a violation of the Honor Code!
During the interview process, it was unclear to me whether the student had been contacted yet. At subsequent class meeting, the student appeared not to know about the honor case, asking for their assignment back. Later, I was not informed of the outcome of the interview process directly. I was told the outcome by my advising professor, who was not contacted by the committee for several months after the interviews.
In addition to the time-issues, the counsel for the accused made a statement in his closing remarks that made it sound like the counsel for the community had dragged me out of a seedy bar, cleaned me up, and put me in the witness chair to testify (implying that I was either lying, mistaken, or confused). Being referred to as such (when I initiated the case) was not respectful.
I felt as if I was on trial. The student admitted guilt. The offense was serious. It all came down to his retraction and whether it was a legitimate retraction. No one believed me. No one had any faith in my 25 years of experience and chose to listen to this lying, cheating, manipulative (expletive deleted).

**Q B26: How satisfied were you with the overall process of the Honor case? (Asked only of those who have reported a case)**

Some of rules set by the Honor System are not based on justice.
The student was clearly guilty. In fact, the jury unanimously found that she had the act and intent, but they voted that it was not serious enough to be expelled. So apparently, cheating AND LYING TO THE HONOR COMMITTEE is not a serious offense. I'm never going to report a case to the Honor Committee again, because it is just not worth it. Instead, if I have as much evidence as I had this past time, I will make sure that the student either fails the assignment or fails the course. If the student believes they did not cheat, then they can start a trial against ME.
The system simply does not work. UVa students think far too highly of current arrangements out of a misplaced veneration of what is called tradition. Simply put, violators are not punished.
Plagiarism is the problem I most often see in my classes. The Honors system seems adversarial toward faculty, and predisposed to believe that students don't understand

Q: B29

plagiarism, even when they are given many opportunities to learn about it. UVa students are exceptionally bright, and they should be held responsible for this concept just like any other we teach them.
It took up way too much of my time, the process was not as quick or precise as it should have been given the weight of the evidence, and the whole experience left me with a very bad impression of the Honor System.
A student who blatantly cheated was found not guilty. Why would I be satisfied?
In one particular case, clear evidence of cheating was demonstrated and the student essentially admitted it during the trial. The student was found not guilty despite this. Although I was not told anything about the jury deliberations, I suspect that the jury did not feel comfortable with the single sanction and found the student innocent despite clear guilt.
As I just explained, the committee refused to bring a case to trial in the face of overwhelming evidence of guilt. I could imagine a jury ultimately finding this student to be not proven guilty, especially given our single sanction, but the committee's unwillingness to even mount a trial was just incredible. Every professor to whom I pitched the facts of this case concluded that the guy was clearly and obviously guilty as sin. My response to this case was perhaps exacerbated by the fact that this student was a football player with an absolutely abysmal academic record at the University. He never should have been allowed to stay here beyond his first year. (I realize that this background is irrelevant to the charge of cheating.)
I had great trouble getting the students who witnessed the cheating on the final exam to step forward and make an accusation to the Honor Committee. They did not want to be responsible for expelling a fellow student. I held their feet to the fire and finally they did (three of them) bring charges. But at trial, it was decided either that the cheating had not in fact occurred (even though the student was seen going over his notes during the exam) OR that the cheating, though proven, was not serious enough. I thought the whole procedure had turned into a waste of time.
It is a lose/lose proposition. Either the student is found guilty and expelled, which hardly makes me feel positive, or found innocent, in which case they get away with cheating. Nearly all my complaints are rooted in the single sanction system.
Both cases resulted in a plea of contributing mental disorder. In both cases such a disorder was found and the case dismissed. I remain deeply skeptical that the students had psychological conditions that were significantly different from those experienced by many other students.
I was a witness in the case. I'm sure the kid cheated. I never heard what happened, so I assume they didn't go to trial.
Cumbersome and complex process, time consuming, lack of direct support and guidance.
The student apparently was not dismissed despite clear evidence of having lied.
I feel that student jurors may not be capable of rising above societal-induced racism and end of just reflecting the racism of the legal system as a whole; additionally, I don't think the defendant's lawyer in my case took the process nearly as seriously as he should have.
A student who has made cheating a lifestyle at this university was allowed to stay. He is a Jefferson Scholar, a Rodman Scholar and will graduate with the respect and admiration of everyone. But he doesn't deserve a degree from the university. His retraction was made two weeks after I filed charges but the Honor Committee chose to believe him, not me. The accused student brought his girlfriend to the hearing and she was also in my class. I felt very ganged up on.
It is clear that the peer judiciary will not convict a student for what they consider as a 'minor' offense. (i.e., cheating for a few points on the test), even when the evidence is ironclad.
Students that clearly cheated and admitted to cheating were not sanctioned.
It seems like there is almost no credible threat the Honor System can give to students. In other words, it seemed like they needed to see a picture of the student cheating to prove that he was cheating.

Q: B29

**Q B28 Other: What did you think about the outcome of the Honor case process? (Asked only of those who have reported a case)**

In both cases the students should have received punishment. In one case dismissal was warranted. In the other case some punishment less than dismissal would have been appropriate.

**Q B29: Do you have suggestions for improving the Honor case process? (Asked only of those who have reported a case)**

Either get rid of the seriousness clause, get rid of the single sanction, or allow forgiveness after a certain amount of time. We are an academic institution, not an old boys club. We deal with situations by examining them and determining the most effective solution, not by hiding behind laws and regulations. The real world does not behave in binary, but rather it runs in shades of gray. It is disturbing to think that I attend the same institution as the incredibly ignorant people who are against reform because they think we should stick to tradition.

Get rid of the single sanction. This skews all aspects of process.

Orientation for incoming students should (if it doesn't already) include a mandatory session on what constitutes plagiarism and other cheating. That way all students will have a common understanding of the topics, and can't claim that they missed the day when that was discussed.

I think involving students is a laudable goal. But there should be a professional staff that handles academic violations. This would allow for continuity, but also would help to restore a measure of professionalism to the system. Additionally, the single sanction is, in my opinion, wholly inappropriate for most honor violations. Suspension, with an indication on the record, plus community service would often seem to be a better sentence.

More people need to abide by it.

Since faculty are the ones who initiate cases, we need to be clear about the fact that students play no role at that point (initiation) in most cases.

I will avoid it in the future by never giving take home exams or pledged homework.

If student juries are going to expect physical evidence such as photographs and / or witnesses, we may need to install cameras in classrooms or, at a minimum, the counsel for the community needs to work harder to find witnesses.

Keep up the good work.

I see no hope for the Honor System because students do not believe that cheating is a violation of trust. Changing the names and moving the chairs around won't fix that. I favor the abolition of the system and its replacement by faculty panels with non-voting student representatives.

More student-imitated cases so that it doesn't come down to faculty versus students.

The process isn't the problem, it's a process deformed by the single sanction.

The procedure is Byzantine, burdened with its heavy responsibility of throwing students out of school. Since there are only two outcomes (student leaves or student stays), there are no useful discussions of how the student might compensate, respond, or recuperate. The process itself is hindered by the commitment to the single sanction, which has serious problems. Additionally, from a TA's perspective, we are not given enough information in teacher training about our responsibilities and liabilities regarding honor cases.

It would be nice if the Honor Advisor would follow up with the faculty member once the case has been resolved. In my single experience, I did not learn of the outcome of the case until much later when I directly asked the honor advisor what the status was. In that case, the Honor Committee found that there was a contributing mental disorder and the student did not go to trial.

The process was fine, but the committee's judgment was deeply flawed. By any reckoning, this student's behavior more likely than not constituted cheating, but since there was no smoking gun (e.g., hard evidence of a paper copied from the internet); they refused to bring the case to trial. The student had not attended the class a single day during the entire term, he wrote a paper on a topic not included in a short list of permitted topics, he used resources not included in the syllabus, yet both the paper topic and the relevant resources WERE included in the previous year's syllabus and assignments. Was it more likely than not that this student, a student whose academic record was hopelessly bad, opened a drawer in the athletic department or jock frat house and pulled out his term paper for my course? To think it wasn't more likely than not flies in the face of experience and logic. So, here's my suggestion: if the Honor Committee is going to insist on smoking guns rather than on extremely solid and obvious inferences, then it should say so and stop pretending that it is adhering to a more likely than not standard of evidence for bringing cases to trial.

I have felt for a long time that the penalty of dismissal was too harsh for first offenders. This inhibits reporting and, thus, works against reducing cheating. In general, the certainty of being caught is a much greater barrier to cheating than the level of the penalty.

The students should not be in charge and the single-sanction system is ridiculous.

I think that the single sanction works at multiple levels to impair the Honor System. Students are reluctant to bring charges, trial juries are reluctant to find fellow students guilty and professors are often sure that cheating has occurred but do not wish to expel a student. This has been a hot-button issue in my 36 years at UVa, and UVa alumni seem to care more in retrospect for the virtues of the Honor System than current students do for its preservation. I think that we need a set of multiple sanctions, ranging from F in the course, to a semester's suspension, to a year's suspension, to expulsion. There was much talk among the faculty two years ago about rehabilitation and even an idea of a bell-ringing ceremony to alert us to the rehabilitation of an honor offender. I doubt that these pseudo-religious ceremonies would be appropriate or effective, but we should not just be expelling those whom we regard as beyond the pale. At bottom, I confess that I fundamentally disagree with a policy that seeks to identify some students as dishonorable (known elsewhere perhaps as incorrigible sinners), who should be expunged from our records and purged from our body. But my disagreements with the basic tenets of the Honor System might be mollified if the single sanction were to be modified to work more flexibly.

The single sanction system needs to be revised, badly. After submitting two cases last spring semester, I have serious doubts that I will do so again in the future.

End the single sanction. It effectively prevents any punishment in most cases even when the student clearly committed an offense.

This is not really about the case process, but I would like to suggest that what constitutes an Honor Violation should be redrawn. It is ridiculous to include public drunkenness. Practically every single undergrad in the university should be expelled if that's going to be a considered a violation. Including something like that basically ensures that many students will see the System as a joke. Drug issues are also, I believe, gratuitous. Why not keep the focus on the coursework (exams, papers, etc)? No student is going to report another for being drunk! In addition, it is a shame to include items about drunkenness or drug use but not sexual harassment.

I have a problem with the single sanction, as I believe, do a lot of professors at the University. I think that if there were variations in punishments related to the degree of seriousness of the offense (-after all, the Honor Committee are supposedly used to judging whether or not an offense is serious enough for the student to be expelled-) then we would see more people willing to use the Honor System.

As a former Honor Counsel, I can't stress how important constant communication with faculty members is to maintain good relationships - most faculty members don't know the process, and don't really care that a student-run system has some timing problems, no matter what. Advisors have to communicate with faculty members at least once a week to let them know that the case is still important to the Honor System because if they don't, faculty members just think that the Honor System isn't handling the case.

Abolish the single sanction. Actually convict someone from time to time.
Assign a specific person to assist throughout the process. Provide professional counseling during process.
Put issues of academic dishonesty (plagiarism, etc) in the hands of faculty and administrators.
First and foremost, drop the single sanction. We should be attempting to rehabilitate students, especially those who are brought to the university due to their athletic ability but who are ill equipped for the academics. We know they will have problems I would heartily endorse removal from the university for a second offense, but it's too harsh as it stands - students cheat regularly at this university. The clever ones are more likely to get away with it while the inept get caught.
I'm involved in an ongoing Honor case and so the answers as to fair treatment of the student as well as my satisfaction with the outcome should not be taken as final. I do not know the outcome and I do not know enough details at this point to speak to the fairness of the process for the student. Your survey should have space to describe situations of this sort, but it does not. In terms of my own observation of the Honor System: First, I think the addition of an Honor Committee member to each jury is a good idea, since that member will be able to clarify Honor policy to the students on the jury. Second, many professors and TAs do not report possible Honor violations, especially in terms of cheating for two reasons: 1) many professors and TAs feel that single sanction is either too harsh or there is not enough evidence in many cases and would rather simply fail a student on the assignment or exam on which the cheating occurred, thus I would say as much as 90% of cheating violations do not get reported for these two reasons 2) in cases where cheating was clear cut, likely intentional, and there is clear evidence of a violation, professors and TAs still have a hard time bringing cases to Honor because the vast majority of cases end in acquittal. This means that professors and TAs are self-censoring prior to reporting and are only bringing the clearest cut cases to Honor, and still few violations are actually upheld. From the prospective of many professors and TAs this is a very disheartening situation, because we are on the front lines and see how much cheating is actually occurring and yet cannot even get the most egregious cases to stick. Thus essentially the Honor System in its current form, from the perspective of many professors and TAs, is not working.
Please be respectful of faculty schedules when attempting to set up meetings. Contact us early and often and keep us informed. Anything that can be done to speed up the case process would be appreciated on both ends. A fairly uncomplicated case with 1-2 witnesses plus the initiator that takes six months or more to go to trial is unacceptable.
Well, you might consider waiting until the trials have been completed before asking me to fill out this survey, as some of the closing questions regard the overall process, which I have not yet seen through to completion.
I feel many undergrads don't understand that beyond a reasonable doubt is not the same as 100% certain, and therefore they are reluctant to find a student guilty.
A few years ago, I had an honor case fail to move past the Investigative Panel. I can't imagine why because the case was cut and dry to me... clearly cheating and clearly serious. Something about the process didn't work right. If the iPanel deemed my case was too weak, there perhaps could have been a round whereby they let me know what additional information was needed. As it was, I presented a case without knowing what factors were most important to them and I had no recourse after their judgment.
The case that I had is not yet complete and therefore my answers inappropriate. I thought very highly of the honor officers who collected the information (I have forgotten what their formal name is).
The accused has colossal power in this process. When that is a faculty member, a vindictive personality can unfairly twist the process. When a student or TA initiates, a lack of knowledge of the system makes it difficult for them to properly prepare and take the appropriate leadership role in the process. This is a student run system in a very limited way. It would be improved greatly if a handful of full time employs (UVA alums just out) ran the process.

Q: B29

Investigators should be more thorough to see if there is other cheating besides just what I report (the student plagiarized many more passages than I identified, and he lied about sources, the trial counsel found those rather than the investigators).
Investigate cases over the summer involving papers turned in May.
Somehow involve the students. The students are totally absent from reporting cases in my classes. The responsibility is all to the instructor. The system does not work in its current form due to inaction by the student body.
Have hearings in a more timely manner. Have meetings in the summer to process all the spring cases. Do not hold meetings at night, which is a difficult time for the faculty. And make sure the members of the Honor Committee live up to the ideal themselves. I was horrified to see a student I was a well-known offender in my department as a member of the Honor Committee.
Graded sanctions would result in more convictions. Current system rewards student who continue lying during the trial and gives positive feedback on the wrong behavior.
I think the multi-stage process is highly conducive to justice.
If there are different levels of punishment, then the outcome may become fairer.
Cases that happen near the end of the spring semester need to be handled over the summer. Waiting until the fall is too long.

**Q B30 Other: Why did you choose not to report cases to the Honor Committee?**

There are clearly permissible forms of cheating within student culture: copying papers from fraternity and sorority paper files, for instance, or copying sections of papers from on-line sources. Students for the most part do not see plagiarism as serious, or at least, not serious enough to warrant permanent expulsion. Consequently, it's pointless to submit such cases to the honor process.
Students are at the University to learn, and the single sanction policy does not provide any way to learn from mistakes. I believe I was able to handle the situation myself more fairly, and in a way that the student will benefit from, rather than ruining a student's college career.
In talking with faculty colleagues who had brought honor charges in the past, their experience was so negative that I decided I didn't want to do that to myself. Faculty said their character and integrity were attacked. They said if they were choosing again whether to pursue honor charges that they would not.
There is no point in submitting an honor offense to the Honor Committee. Cheating on an exam or homework is not considered serious enough to warrant the single sanction, so the students know full well that they won't get booted from the University as a result.
The student cheated on three extra credit assignments (attend a presentation and write a short reaction paper), which would likely not have been serious enough for conviction. I called him into my office, explained that I had attended all three talks and he was not at any of them and asked for an explanation. I gave him zeros for the extra credit assignments. I felt that his lying violated my trust and the hard work and hours that other students put into the assignment. I would have pursued it with the Honor Committee had there been no seriousness clause.
Past experience - a very clear case of cheating (in my opinion and that of four other colleagues) was dismissed. This case was questionable.
Professor explicitly stated he didn't want to become involved in the trial.
I determined that cheating had not occurred.
I wish that UVA would can the can't about student self-rule and honor if it is not enforced. Who are we fooling other than the Board of Visitors?
No cases to report.
I suspected but wasn't sure, couldn't prove it.



I did not know the identity of the student.
I felt confident of my ability to bring the matter to a fair and appropriate resolution.
It turned out that my suspicion was wrong. The student didn't cheat.
Colleagues who have brought cases to the Honor System report it is an emotionally draining time-suck. My most recent case of clear-cut cheating involved an ESL student who quite clearly plagiarized (after repeated warnings), by using verbatim phrasing without quotation marks. But he made sure to cover himself by throwing in a citation. This is clear plagiarism, but he was gaming the Honor System - counting on the hope that students would excuse the plagiarism because of the citation. In sum, he was hoping that the gravity of the single sanction would incline the Honor Committee to look for a way not to find him guilty. I had ample basis to fail him, but that would only mean that we would see him again in the same required class. He showed no interest in learning. So I gave him a D-. He has moved on, but the grade signals (to anyone reading his transcript) that he is a problematic student.
The day following my Fall, 2005 final exam, a student reported that she found lecture notes and a study guide in the women's restroom. By that time, the notes had disappeared. Since the class had 130 students taking the final, and about 10 left to use the restroom, I was unable to determine which student was responsible for placing the notes in the restroom.
My concern about the single sanction is not that I don't want to be responsible for having a student dismissed. My concern is that the single sanction operates as a corrosive factor in the system as a whole. It makes a mockery of justice and of pedagogy, and it creates hushed anxiety around the topic of academic honesty, rather than fostering open, educational discussion.
Understanding of cultural issues involved, the intention was not to cheat.
Faculty members who have reported honor violations have generally told me that they regretted it and ended up feeling that they were on trial rather than the student accused of cheating.
I was in an administrative position and became aware of the situation. The faculty member in the course handled the situation.
In the case in question the student very nearly plagiarized her work. She borrowed the main points and ideas directly from an internet site but changed sentence structure and other small points. I was unclear whether this met the formal standards of an honor violation. I also felt that a strong shot across her bows (long very direct talk about it, total resubmission required) might get her to change her behavior. Finally, I was aware that some of her behavior was driven by fear and issues with her father regarding authority, leading her to either rebel vigorously or over-comply. I guess I felt that in this case it was better to send a very strong warning and see if she could shape up.
The alternative remedy (a lower grade) was equally effective, as the student was a graduate student for whom a lower grade would end their degree pursuit. The case was particularly blatant, (It was absolutely certain that cheating had occurred.). If this had not been so obvious, I would have probably gone through the Honor Committee for the benefits of a trial. The student also lied when confronted, and subsequently attempted to get another student to do pledged work for them (which the other student wisely did not, and reported to me). The lower grade led to the student's GPA falling below that which was acceptable at UVA, and effectively led to expulsion.
I didn't suspect anyone.
My school has a separate, faculty-run disciplinary system. The student was expelled. Also, the incident occurred right before graduation when there would not have been enough time to go through the Honor System procedure.
In some of the cases, fellow undergraduates refused to testify against the students in question. I didn't witness the events, so I felt it was unfair to report the case to the Honor Committee. In the one case where the cheating was well supported by physical evidence, I felt that a single sanction was too strong a punishment for the level of infraction. In the cases in which I've suspected cheating, I preferred to move the student to a seat in front of me. I'd rather have them stop cheating, and have the threat of severe punishment, rather than to be

<p>given no second chance.</p>
<p>There is not enough time in the day to follow up on all of the cheating. Students can get off too easily by saying cheating was not their intention. I have heard some amazing excuses. A fourth year UVa students claimed that s/he thought that as long as s/he didn't use quote marks, s/he could lift paragraphs word for word and that would not be cheating. No quotes - no need to recognize the source! I think we should be able to fail cheaters in a course (not just on the assignment) and remove them from our courses. I'd rather devote my time to the students who are not cheating. When an instructor goes through an honor trial this steals time from the students who are not on trial. I also think students themselves should be more involved in reporting other students. Instead they often tell the instructor so that they may remain anonymous and uninvolved. This is a student-run initiative, after all. If students do not wish to run it, faculty should have the freedom to establish their own course policies on cheating.</p>
<p>Expulsion as a single sanction is contradictory and self-defeating. It gainsays our stated desire to build a community: in a community there must be redemption. The surreptitious removal of students prevents others from learning from the incidence. It is also self-defeating because it discourages reporting.</p>
<p>The student was a first year foreign student who did not fully understand how seriously plagiarism is taken here and I felt referral to the honors committee would result in unfair punishment and dismissal.</p>
<p>If plagiarism is clearly unintentional and committed out of ignorance I won't turn it over to the HC the first time. I work with the student directly.</p>
<p>Bad past experience with an honor trial.</p>
<p>I believe that undergraduate students (especially if they don't work in my area of the humanities) are in some cases just not qualified to understand why a faculty member might believe work to be plagiarized. This is not malicious prejudice on my part, just knowledge of the difference between an expert witness and an inexperienced witness.</p>
<p>The situation was that a student submitted a document as a draft form that had been plagiarized, in part, from other sources. I was concerned that the student (a foreign student) may not be aware that his / her approach taken in the initial stage of writing the draft version was not appropriate and also an honor offense. Since this was a draft submitted for my comments and criticisms and not a final piece of work, I felt it was appropriate to relay that the plagiarized material was a violation of the Honor Code and indicate that subsequent versions of the manuscript must be original writing.</p>
<p>My response to the previous question was that I had NOT suspected cases - so this question does not apply. If we are referring to my response to the occasion in which I was certain, then I did not file an Honor offense in that case because dismissal would too harsh a punishment for the particular offense.</p>
<p>Thought the response - failed assignment - was appropriate for the violation, given students' own understanding of the situation and given my sense of why they did cheat.</p>
<p>In part, my decision was based upon the importance of the assignment, a reading quiz worth 2% of the students grade, seemed too insignificant combined with the cheating students were primarily first semester students at UVa and I felt that a second chance was warranted due to the small importance of the reading quiz to the students' grades. And finally, and most importantly, after talking to eight (or nine) full-time faculty colleagues, they unanimously felt that the Honor System did not punish offenders - each had brought students before the Committee with proof of cheating and NONE were found guilty. The Honor Committee seems too afraid of punishing offenders - the seriousness clause is used as an excuse to find guilty students not guilty - if students were serious about honor, students who cheat/collaborate without permission would be found guilty. Perhaps most of all, my reasoning was that the students would be found not guilty based on my knowledge of past honor cases and I did not want to be told (via a non-guilty verdict) that MY honor, integrity and experience meant nothing. Some of these students were student athletes and I have also been aware of athletic academic advisors who provide synopses of readings for courses</p>

<p>or encourage students to collaborate. This is problematic because these individuals in a position of authority are encouraging students to cheat - but the students, hearing such advice from authority figures, don't know that their actions, in fact, are contrary to the Honor Code. How does one deal with this situation?</p>
<p>Student made a conscientious retraction.</p>
<p>I suspected a problem, but was not certain.</p>
<p>To clarify: two students collaborated in violation of my rules about how individuals could work together in groups on particular homework's. Based on the results of past cases submitted by my department to the Honor System, infractions like this on individual homework's are generally viewed as not serious enough by Honors juries to merit the single sanction. The case where I suspected was one that was reported by a student in my class, who consulted with me before submitting the case. I had no direct evidence, but based on this student's report I now of course suspect a violation occurred.</p>
<p>These cases may have been due to misunderstanding of the assignment - that is, what help is allowable and what is not.</p>
<p>Since the student had a learning disability, after talking it over with the professor and the person in charge of the program that provided the help to the student, we decided that the help that he received was appropriate.</p>
<p>I have gone through the honor process many times and it has not resulted in a guilty verdict. I don't accuse unless I know the student is guilty.</p>
<p>I teach a course for first student students who are new to the university and the university culture. Many are foreign and do not properly know the rules regarding plagiarism. One cannot fault a student for breaking a rule that they do not understand, and my job is to teach them these rules. Removing the student because of their ignorance seems overly harsh.</p>
<p>I could never really catch anything definitive, just circumstances, nothing that made me sure it was clearly cheating. I also didn't want to wrongly accuse anyone.</p>
<p>In the most obvious case, the student was a First Year who came from an underrepresented background. I felt that teaching her that cheating was wrong was more useful than destroying her shot at a college degree from UVa. After admonishing the student, failing her on the assignment, and giving her stern talking to, she has become a very good student. I've taught her in two other courses since and she knows that I examine her work very closely, just as I do with all of my students.</p>
<p>Wanted to give the student a second chance in case it was not intentional.</p>
<p>The extent to the plagiarism was not big, so it seemed that drawing this to the students' notice would be adequate.</p>
<p>In addition, experience as a juror on an honor trial made me skeptical of the professionalism of the Honor Committee. In my opinion, the defendant, represented by an Honor Committee member, did not receive good counsel or a vigorous defense. I came to believe Honor Committee members, regardless of their role in the trial, presumed guilt rather than innocence. Justice did not seem to be blind.</p>
<p>In particular, possible unequal treatment of minorities.</p>
<p>I suspected that the student submitted an essay that she had written for a prior course.</p>
<p>I did not want to be accused of being a racist.</p>
<p>In the instance of known cheating, the instructor for which I was a TA refused to take action.</p>
<p>After discussing with first the faculty member in charge of the course and then the students themselves, it was clear that all these violations were innocent. That is, the students themselves were unaware that what they had done was wrong. All of the cases were instances of minor plagiarism. These cases were excellent teaching opportunities. Once the students were aware what they had done was wrong, if it had ever happened again, I would have felt completely comfortable reporting to the Honor Committee.</p>
<p>I concluded that she didn't commit the violation.</p>
<p>While I support the single sanction, I wanted to give the students involved the chance to confess to the cheating in exchange for a zero on the exam. They did so. But I was glad that</p>

the Honor System was there, because it gave me the stick I needed to elicit a confession.
I was not 100% sure that the student had cheated, and he assured me quite strongly that he did not. I decided to keep a close eye on him from then on out and only report something that I felt VERY sure about.
The process too cumbersome and slow, lack of support from colleagues, insufficient willing support and information from the Honor Committee.
In the most recent case, the student was a minority student and was prominently involved in student government and minority organizations. Any charges brought against this student would have been labeled as racist, particularly by [NAME]. My colleagues have had multiple issues with Dean Turner and avoid any possible contact with him in such cases.
I thought it was adequate to handle the matter through my school's internal committee.
The Honor System asks about the student's motivation. This is irrelevant from the perspective of a professor. Faculty asks whether or not an infraction has occurred. Too often the student is found "innocent" (the action was 'unintentional'), and the message that comes across is that the offense is not serious.
My understanding from conversations with many faculty members is that even with strong evidence the committee almost never punishes students. The process is long and complicated, and since the students are usually let off with a warning, I didn't feel it worth the trouble.
It was not clear that the students involved understood that what they had done constituted an honor offense.
The issue was plagiarism on a paper and I strongly suspected it but was not able to locate the source. I worked with the course professor and the student was asked to rewrite the paper and resubmit it with an automatic grade deduction.
I did not on account of my own previous experience in reporting cases to the Honor Committee and seeing them through Honor System proceedings.
It wasn't a big deal.
I wasn't sure whether it was plagiarism or not, and after speaking to her I was convinced that she had not violated the Honor Code.
I decided that, given this student's academic culture (he was from another country); he did nothing dishonorable in memorizing and typing out long passages on a closed-book exam. We (including I) need to educate foreign students about what is considered acceptable work in the US.
All suspicious cases reported.
That case was already in the hands of the Honor Committee.
While fairly certain the student did not produce the work I was unable to backtrack it to the source.
Unless caught in the act of cheating, students are routinely cleared of all charges.
At the time I talked with the student, I knew that the student who had witnessed the possible violation was almost certainly going to report the case to the Honor Committee. That indeed happened. However, even if the witnessing student had decided not to report the violation, I doubt that I would have.
The student voluntarily left the University without completing a degree.
Part of my job as ESL writing instructor is to teach about plagiarism, which is not uniformly defined across cultures. It was a learning experience.
The assignment was homework that was not pledged, but two students had obviously identical spreadsheet printouts. Copying is still unacceptable though. Talked to Professor and only gave a zero grade.
The suspicion was mild, and no way to verify - I was concerned about an essay assignment that seemed better written than previous assignments, but not out of the realm of possibility.
From my understanding, once accused, the student can admit wrongdoing and be let off. If you don't think there is cheating at UVA, WAKE UP! The thing that really bothers me is that LIFE is lived by the Honor Code! We all need to be honorable citizens and do what is right

Q: B30

when faced with situations. As an out-of-state TA, and following that time as an adjunct, I was DISGUSTED with the students at UVA. I had people signing into a screening and walking out (clearly DISHONORABLE behavior), among other things. The Honor Code does NOT work, and you should make serious changes to it right away!
Very bad experience with previous use of the Honor Committee trial system.
She ended up not cheating because she didn't turn in her work.
This was homework that did not count toward a grade. I work with international students and there is a cultural component to sharing answers that I believe would not be considered once the Honor Committee was involved.
Discussion with student and colleagues removed my suspicions.
Colleagues did not think the offense (web plagiarism) was intentional.
I was convinced that my suspicion was unfounded.
In my experience, professors frequently encounter cheating and do not report it (the advice of my department chair was to give a zero on the particular assignment and require a re-write). If I knew that other professors turned students in for cheating, I would do the same. I think the single-sanction is fair. On the other hand, there seems to be a gray area on plagiarism - some students seem to understand they are cheating; others seem not to be aware that they need to cite the source of their information or research (especially if it is not a research paper per se). In the past I've spoken with individual students and tried to ascertain if it was an honest mistake or not. But the bottom line is that I feel that the faculty does not uphold the Honor System in so far as reporting cheating - this has been made abundantly clear to me whenever I've consulted colleagues. Most of them in my department give a zero for cheating.
The lead faculty member was the decision-maker for the course.
The fact of the student possibly cheating only dawned on me later - weeks later. By that time, however, I chose to take no action because the student was well on his way to failing the course due to lack of attendance, work of increasingly mediocre quality, and absence at the final exam. Also, evidence was flimsy.
I wasn't sure whether the issue at hand was an Honor Code violation, so I discussed this with two individuals in Booker House. One advised me that the matter did not constitute a reportable offense, and that I needed to clarify orally and in my syllabus about when collaboration for classroom participation was OK and when it was not OK.
I was dealing with a student returning to college after several years away and assumed this was a first offense and that the student understood the wrongfulness of his / her action and would not repeat it.
It was a graduate student - and an outstanding one. I would have reported her if she had denied having copied from a printed source. But she admitted having done it - said she copied from her own notes from the source - inadvertently. In any event, the source was in German - hard for Honor to deal with. She DID rewrite the paper. I DO believe, however, that the process of reporting is time consuming and onerous for the professor! This is especially true when the plagiarism takes place in a foreign language.
My superior decided against it.
I reported it to The Center where I work. They reviewed the material and sent it on to UVA to be looked at and they felt it was not enough proof to go before the committee.
After checking with the student, I concluded she hadn't cheated at all.
I investigated more closely and was convinced that the student had not cheated on the assignment in question.
In one instance, the student seemed repentant and I trusted her to not do it again. In another, the student didn't seem to be here to get an education, he seemed to be here for varsity sports, he did not come to class prepared, he was disrespectful, I knew he would put up a fight, and that it would be my word against his, and frankly, I feared for my safety and I didn't think he was worth the bother.
Student had limited command of the English language. The assignment was a final research

<p>paper. The student was embarrassed to express herself in English. So I spoke with the department and the student about the infraction (plagiarism from the internet), lowered the student's grade, and required her to re-submit. But before I did any of this, I ran it by the department head.</p>
<p>Without the "no toleration" clause, the Honor System is not really an Honor System. If you get to pick and choose when you want to be honorable, then the Honor System is reduced to an unfair crapshoot. You really need to bring the non-toleration clause back, or the Honor System will deteriorate and become even more irrelevant than it is today.</p>
<p>I felt that what I was able to do (speak with the student to explain why I had thought their behavior inappropriate and lower the grade of the assignment) was the most appropriate response to the incident. The Honor Code, as currently constituted, is a throwback to nostalgic concept of honor that has never, in practical terms, existed. (I would allow that the concept of honor as embodied in the Honor Code *may* exist in the military context.) It seems to me that the Honor Code is not so much a way to create a cohesive community through consensus about important ethical concepts as it is a way for a minority, who believe themselves above making mistakes, to extract vindictive, rather than just, punishment from those who do make mistakes.</p>
<p>It was only a faint suspicion. I lacked clear enough evidence even to confront the student.</p>
<p>The matter was mentioned to the athletic academic advisors, I presume they did nothing since the incidents I am referring to happen while the athletes were in 'study hall' or meeting with their 'tutors'.</p>
<p>Primarily, this was a moment of not having enough evidence to move forward. However, in this case the questionable work also seemed to be a symptom rather than a pattern of behavior with the student - as evidenced when speaking with other instructors. He seemed not to understand rather than to be deliberately flouting rules. Thus, as a professional TEACHER I took it as a moment to continue instruction rather than a moment to punish potential - and improvable - poor judgment.</p>
<p>I was not convinced that this was conscious cheating. In other words, I suspected that the student was misusing sources because s/he didn't adequately understand the conventions of research and academic writing.</p>
<p>Told the professor and let him decide course of action.</p>
<p>Student left UVa before official reporting could occur.</p>
<p>The assignment was only worth 3% of the overall grade and I was certain that the Honor Committee would not kick out a student for what might be seen as a small offense.</p>
<p>Without going into details, I felt the penalty would be too harsh for this particular infraction. Also, I felt that it could be more effectively dealt with in another manner.</p>
<p>In addition to my objections to the single sanction system, I felt that many of these violations could have been honest mistakes. For example, I've had students paraphrase or quote verbatim from websites without proper citation on essays or research papers. While it's possible that these students were intentionally trying to pass off someone else's writing or thoughts as their own, it can also be sloppiness or failure to understand how to use a source honestly (I'm sure I've messed up footnotes when cutting and pasting too!). The students I've seen do this were both first-years. I hope that giving them a lower grade helped them learn this lesson without dashing their hopes of a degree from UVa.</p>
<p>The Honor System is counter to academic principles. We all learn from each other. Why not encourage a culture of citation instead of one of isolation?</p>
<p>The incident of cheating was ambiguous.</p>
<p>It was merely a suspicion, and given my future experience with the two students I now believe that it was nothing. I would like to point out, however, that I do believe single sanction is far too harsh a penalty, and would be unlikely to take an isolated incident to the Honor Committee even if I had proof. I believe this kind of situation is best sorted between student and teacher, with a committee possibly serving as a kind of Supreme Court if the student and teacher are unable to resolve the problem.</p>
<p>I asked the student to provide evidence to support why it shouldn't be reported.</p>

Q: B30

I just wasn't 100% sure this person was cheating. So, I did not want to have him/her convicted of cheating if he/she didn't do it.
After discussing the situation with the students involved my colleague and I were convinced that no cheating had taken place.
I only had a suspicion and there was no way of proving that the student had cheated.
The professor in charge of the course talked to the student and judged that she'd been unaware that her actions were considered a form of cheating.

**Q B35: What aspects of you experience affected your impressions the most?**

The unwillingness of a student to bring forth charges because of fear of exclusion from a community of students.
It seems to work pretty well at UVA. It did not work well at a university where I served previously.
It has been my experience that the students value and respect the Honor System.
Time delay in resolving the accusation. Outcome of the accusation.
The idea that someone can cheat in class, lie to the Honor Committee, and then not be punished whatsoever because it is all or nothing.
Presentations by student representatives suggested at least some students take it seriously.
Some years ago the chair of the Honor Committee informed his fraternity brother that his submitting a paper based on a file paper would be laughed out of the Honor System if charges were filed.
Results are absurd, produced by a mindless sanction regime that does nothing actually to help educate students who are participating in dubious activity.
Students found guilty, but not seriously, so no penalty.
The personal tension resulting from initiating an honor action.
A student in my course went through an honor trial for a different course. In the outcome of the case, I thought that a lot of ethical and pedagogical distinctions were lost since the case only had to decide on an all-or-nothing punishment, and that this particular case was decided in the student's favor because it was found she did not have the intent to plagiarize. I thought this gave the wrong impression that everything she did was OK, and it furthered my resolve not to use the Honor System to police my classroom (when more local punishments and involvements would be more appropriate).
One of my graduate advisees was tried and convicted a few years ago. The process took over six months to sort out, and the student felt unfairly treated (judging by the results of recent public trials, I believe justly). Instead of learning from experience, he was forced to leave the country, and was bitter and believed the problem was getting caught and lacking the opportunities domestic students have to defend themselves in the process.
A trial of a student who admitted copying on the final exam but was acquitted because she had established a student-teacher relationship with the other student during the year so it was OK to get her help.
It seems that the Honor System is only relevant for students who lack honor in the first place. Honorable students do not cheat. Students without honor seem to take little personal responsibility when they do cheat, and I have found that frustrating.
Asking students to be upstanding citizens in their own community, and giving them the attendant authority to police their own when one of their peers behaves badly.
Time consuming, lack of professionalism, single sanction, etc.
It is difficult for a faculty member to pursue an honor case. And (as mentioned previously), no action is going to be taken if a student cheats, as it's not serious enough to have the single sanction applied.
There are negative and positive aspects. In a different situation, I have been impressed with

Q: B35

<p>the psychological review process. However, my sense is that for the system to work, there need to be different sanctions for the severity of the violation. Without this, students get away with minor infractions that whittle away faculty support and trust in the system. I also feel like my options as an instructor are very limited when a student lies or cheats on something that wouldn't muster seriousness. Giving someone a zero if they cheat on something that is a minor part of the class, often has little impact on the final grade.</p>
<p>Incredible inefficiency of the Honor Committee in contacting an accused student. Use of the Psych Evaluation as a delaying tactic. Use of the Psych Evaluation without an admission of any guilt. The logic seems to be: I am mentally disturbed but I did not cheat so I am not guilty.</p>
<p>No explanation of decision to dismiss a case and procedural limitations on discussing or responding to student explanations.</p>
<p>The horrendous treatment of [NAME]. In order to experience the Honor System, one need not actually interact with it directly. Its horrendous hypocrisies color everything that we do here.</p>
<p>The arrogant, disingenuous, and predatory attitudes of Honor Committee insiders have had a profound negative impact on my opinion of a system that I once very strongly supported. The ambivalence of students outside of the system has also convinced me that the system does not now accomplish its stated goals.</p>
<p>Seeing a great student going through a trial and losing. Also, seeing students who have knurly cheated get away with it.</p>
<p>The difficulty of actually prosecuting a case (a very clear cut case by the way).</p>
<p>The reporting of the outcome of the only trial I was ever personally involved in was never reported to me. Several of my colleagues have had similar or worse experiences. It is a seriously flawed system.</p>
<p>The single sanction is too severe. The fear of students being kicked out actually advocates lying, students are so afraid of the punishment they will do anything not to leave the university. Even if it means sticking to their lie. Furthermore, the Honor System is not a fair system. Certain students find a way around the system. There are tons of rumors about the athletic department-hiring professionals to show that a student-athlete didn't understand what cheating meant. Then there is the painfully obvious statistic that shows a majority of African-American students are expelled. Is it really an issue of honor or is there something much more profound (socially racially) going on. The system is so flawed that professors and TAs take it upon themselves to punish a student with F, rather than go through an honor trial. I've heard stories of TAs bringing students up on cheating, and they were the ones who felt like they were on trial. It is a flawed system and needs to be revised.</p>
<p>That I can trust my students to be respectable adults.</p>
<p>I don't know; I've had a lot of bad experiences with people that are involved with Honor. Most of them think they're better than the other students. The case I'm familiar with was outrageous. Intent is one of the three things necessary for a case to even go to trial. I think the Honor Committee was inclined to move the case along to trial because it was brought up by one of their own members. I think they were embarrassed to have one of their own people bring up a case and pushed it through to save face. It's just unfortunate for the person that had to leave the University.</p>
<p>The esprit established in the academic community - which is possible.</p>
<p>The students involved.</p>
<p>Lack of clear procedure at trial.</p>
<p>The almost total absence of students in the system except at trial (and during advising).</p>
<p>The single sanction is so severe that students and faculty are reluctant to report violations and juries seem to be reluctant to convict. That attitude destroys the integrity of an Honor System.</p>
<p>I have been at workshops for TAs on the Honor Code and was favorably impressed. The recent case, which resulted in conviction but no sentence, made a huge negative impression.</p>



Q: B35

I am not in favor of any reforms of the single sanction and I find it disheartening that so many people seem to feel that a single instance of cheating does not merit immediate dismissal.
The jury did not see the evidence the way I did. At times, I felt like I was on trial for accusing the student. I wish students would initiate more cases if they truly value this system.
Length of time between report of suspected offense and disposition of case leniency of result: insignificance of outcome.
The entire system and how it is well run by students.
Informative presentations by Honor Committee representatives being called as potential jurors.
If a student cheats, then punishment should ensue, not political wrangling.
Responses of MOST students to working within the system - and the response of the system itself when violations have been brought (by me) to the Committee.
Mindless attachment to the single-sanction as if it is synonymous with honor. The single sanction is the single biggest problem with the so-called student run Honor System.
Lack of care by the administration of the instructor in trial cases. I believe, as do many of my colleagues that the single sanction needs to be abolished.
That guilty students are acquitted and that assignments are not all treated as being honor offences if there is cheating.
Colleague's experience, it was lengthy, the evidence was absolutely clear, but the student claimed mental stress and fellow students failed to expel
Interviewed by Honor Committee representative who was supporting an accused student. Provided written statement to be entered into evidence.
I was a jury member in an Honor trial. To see how the system really works and to see the way in which cases were viewed most affected my impressions.
Learning that faculty give unpracticed exams (unheard of in my prior university) and auditing a course and seeing first-hand that students (in that class) honor the Honor Code.
As a student (who didn't cheat!) I loved the Honor Code, and as a professor able to give take-home exams I was still happy with it, but when I discovered cheating in some of my early classes -- and then heard what a pain the Honor Code was to enforce -- I saw some downsides.
The professional and human way it was administered.
I was part of two honor trials in the mid-1990s. I found that many of the students involved in the process did not understand it well and were unreliable.
A little more than two years ago I was involved in an Honor case. It was an open-and-shut case and could have been resolved in a week. It took 9 1/2 months. Because the student was a 4th year, I think that members of the Honor Committee (or people who knew its operations well) helped him, either directly or indirectly, delay the trial until after his graduation. That way his friends, employer and probably even his family never even realized that he never got a degree!
The Honor Committee was serious about the cases, which happened.
Closed to the public.
The ignorance of the student jury and the dishonesty of defense counsel.
An astonishingly blatant case of plagiarism was dismissed by the honors committee.
A sin or two destroyed a life or two and wasted much time. So far as I know, only faculty are perfect. Too often honor trials end up as witchcraft accusations, and I've seen too much of that to condone it
Propensity of the Honor Committee to accept ludicrous defenses in failing to convict cheaters and to ignore reasonable standards of academic conduct.
The students take it seriously.
I don't like the single sanction system. Some students who have violated the Honor Code have mitigating circumstances and they also are potentially able to be rehabilitated. However, the single sanction doesn't allow for any flexibility in this regard. Much like the

capital punishment system, it's easy to believe that the system is working fine until you learn about specific cases where it isn't.
I was called up for honor jury duty but ended up not serving. Besides the fact that I have serious reservations about single sanction, I don't believe that TAs should have to serve on honor juries for undergrads. We teach them and are paid to do so, much like instructors and professors. We already have influence over their fate. Furthermore, they are supposed to have a jury of their peers. I am not a peer in this case, as I am not another undergrad.
The dedication of the young people involved - who, after all, are full time students with their own classes to take and lives to lead, was remarkable.
Interactions with Honor Committee members: clear ambiguity about what constitutes honorable behavior.
That is survives.
I don't have any direct experience. I work at the hospital and don't have tests per se.
I can trust my students. If they say they have been sick, that settles it. If they say they have not used unauthorized sources or worked together on a take home exam, that settles it. Students occasionally report to me things they fear might be violations of class rules. It's clear that everyone values being trusted and would not want to lose the status of being trusted.
Too much talk of shades of violation.
The students' respect for the system.
Single sanction undermines the effectiveness of the system.
A defendant alleged that I had actually taught her to write in a way that, in a subsequent class, got her nailed for plagiarism. The student produced no evidence or witnesses in support of this ridiculous assertion, but I was nevertheless forced to endure an hour of ruthless cross-examination, the purpose of which was to impeach my credibility. I took away from this experience the conclusion that attacking faculty is considered fair game and, for this reason, one should think clearly about the possible adverse consequences - including risks to one's reputation - of involving oneself in the Honor System. I know many faculties who share this view.
Students themselves do not support the Honor System. In my time at UVa, many students have come forward informally to complain about definite instances of cheating. However, all such students have refused to participate initiating an honor action. If UVa students are unwilling to engage in their own process, I won't either. I would rather contract alternatives to the Honor System.
Student jurors do not understand the nature of mathematics / engineering / problem solving. Guilty students bluster their way to not guilty verdicts with tears and claims of misunderstanding many students have vague notions of what cheating is many students want to do the minimum necessary to get by many students don't care about learning the material but only care about the grades. These views of students lead to leniency.
Serving on an honor jury during my second year as a GTA, I tried a student on charges of plagiarism. We heard his case for 12 long hours and found him clearly guilty. As much as it hurt to do it, I voted to impose the single sanction. It weighed heavily on me to dismiss a student, especially in his fourth year, even a student as blatantly unrepentant as this one. However, a few months later, I saw the same student walking to class with a group of friends, and later learned that he had been allowed to remain in school after appealing the verdict. I was ashamed and shocked - after the distress of having my hands tied by the single sanction, I couldn't believe that all our effort of inquiry and deliberation could be overturned by a word from the President. Still, part of me was happy to see mercy shown by someone else, even if I had been prohibited from doing so. I agree with the single sanction, and I don't think anyone who hasn't served on an honor jury can disagree. Despite well-reasoned arguments for or against, until you have sat behind the table and felt the weight of another student's academic life in your hands, you can't truly know how you feel about it. But ever since that experience, I have had a bitter feeling knowing that there are in reality two penalties exist for Honor Code violations - expulsion by your peers, or quiet pardon by the

administration.
I do not agree with the single sanction.
Students who discuss Honor are more concerned to uphold a part real, part imaginary tradition of UVa and are deeply ignorant and disrespectful of the norms of academic integrity that are central to scholarly work. Talking to students, I have seen the phenomenon of the collapse of reform in the face of this idealized tradition repeatedly, including subtle punishments towards students active in attempts at reform. Knowledge of the struggles student reformers have faced have been discouraging, as of course have repeated stories from colleagues about attempts to use the Honor System to address student cheating.
I was positively impressed with the honor advisors and the basic system. The jury trial seems somewhat hit-or-miss not unlike criminal trials. My impression of the jury trial was that of a criminal trial with the accuser (me) being the one on trial. The honor advisors for the accused acted more like prosecuting attorneys than advocates for the truth.
I teach only on the professional level, but my experience is that my students who were UVa students as undergraduates understand and take very seriously the Honor Code. Their respect for the system has given me a positive impression.
Inconsistent follow-up pretrial, explicitly radicalized defense statements.
I believe the vast majority of students in my classes take the Honor System seriously.
Single sanction.
Previous to the last two years, I filed two honor cases where in both cases it was obvious that the student was guilty. In each case the charges were dismissed when the student claimed stress as an excuse. That doesn't lead one to have much faith in the system.
The single sanction, the entirely student-run system, and the lack of a non-toleration clause discourage full and honest participation in the system by faculty and students.
In my department there was an honor case against some graduate students. It was a minor offense (cheating on a homework assignment which was worth less than 1% of the final grade in the class), but the professor instead of exercising the faculty grading option and giving them a zero on the assignment, took them to honor court over it. As a result, the class was revamped in order to get revenge on the students, who were forced to take the class again along with incoming graduate students. The revamping of the course basically implicated lots more busy work and spending \$70 more in course materials whose value as reading material was doubtful. The atmosphere in the department is horrible now, everybody is divided on the issue, the course syllabus has been used as a means of getting revenge on students which is highly unethical (at least as unethical as cheating on a homework assignment, just in a different way)...
My experience is indirect only. I read the student papers and have spoken with colleagues about their experiences.
It seemed as if it worked as advertised.
Despite having a student convicted, he is still here, drawing out the case on appeal. I expect some finality after nine months.
I've had two close friends that have gone through honor trials with students. They were made to feel as if THEY were on trial. In both cases the students were not convicted, despite the clear evidence that they did, primarily because it is difficult for students from non-science majors to understand the evidence in cases involving science/math/engineering. I think that the jury needs to consist of students in a similar discipline so that they have a better understanding of the evidence.
I think that the Honor System is an excellent system that builds self-regulation as a core value. I wonder about non-traditional students at continuing education activities-- such as CME-- where participation does not result in a grade but can affect professional development, credentialing etc. Are faculty bound by the same Honor Code? Is it only limited to students? I would like more information on the interaction from a University perspective of the expectations for faculty and staff to abide by the Honor Code as well.
Contrary to what I was told to expect by my colleagues, the process did not take a significant

Q: B35

amount of my time, nor did I feel that it was adversarial toward me.
My students do seem to adhere to its tenants. This frees me up to teach in the ways that make the most sense without having to spend my time worrying about stopping cheaters.
Just that students were aware of the code and were self-conscious in following it, i.e. in signing the pledge on their tests, etc.
The mysterious insanity plea, which is a way of getting around the single sanction. A poor remedy for a rigid and inappropriate measure.
Procedures are inconsistently applied, so that two students, apparently engaged in the same reported behavior, are not treated the same--one is expelled, the other exonerated.
I think there is a disconnect between the ramifications of being found guilty of an honor offense as compared with punishments associated with other equally egregious misconduct.
Lack of willingness of students to charge a classmate of cheating even when observed. Difficulty of proving the seriousness of an offense. The single sanction.
In my 1st involvement: Incontrovertible evidence of exam tampering resulted in not guilty by a Psych Evaluation panel, in spite of there being multiple incidents in multiple courses. In my 2nd involvement: Very inefficient, disorganized interviewing/trial scheduling. There seemed to be little regard for the value of my time, during the procedures.
It appears to me that it is largely driven by an old-boys-network mentality among the students and the alumni. For them it is very important that the University students have pledged for this Honor Code, it raises the value of their own experience within the university. I am not impressed with it, and I find it sad that apparently honesty is not the natural state of mind but that it requires a system like the Honor Code to flourish.
The disparity between the committee's stated standard of evidence for taking cases to trial (more likely than not) and its judgment in the case I brought. In my view, the committee was actually looking for a certain kind of evidence - i.e., the paper from which the student cheated - rather than evidence that met its announced standard but required inference and judgment. As a result, I have a very dim view of the Honor System. I doubt I'll ever bring another case to them.
Trustworthy behavior.
Long time to resolve situations. I cannot just flunk a student caught cheating. In two cases students who were clearly guilty remained at UVa.
Understandable reluctance of students to convict where there is clear evidence of cheating or plagiarism. It makes the system somewhat hypocritical, in my experience.
Cumbersome procedures and the single sanction, which I think, are clumsy and inappropriate.
The positive attitude of students and faculty about the Honor System.
Seeing a very fine person expelled based on unconvincing evidence.
Overall I found it to be well run and learned that it doesn't find innocent people guilty, but I was a little un-nerved with a bit of the process. In particular, I felt like the closing arguments, where the defense set about to 'cast doubt' on the community's case seemed both too glib and too shady to me. Too glib because at that point I felt like I was in a debate competition, but this is a bad thing when a student's career is at stake. Too shady because it seemed to me that the process should be about uncovering the truth, not about seeing if the community can put together an air tight case or if the charge brought against the student is such that no other hypothesis is compatible with the events or something. At that point in the trial I just felt like we were no longer concerned with finding out the truth but with convicting the student on one side and letting the student off on the other, and I didn't think that was the purpose.
One student conscientiously retracted a very suspicious composition and one student refused to take a listening section (preferring a zero) of a test because he heard some students discussing it outside of class and didn't want to have any unfair advantage. These experiences have made me fairly confident in the Honor System.
As a jury member, I got involved in a case trial. Since then, I realized that there are students cheating on their assignment or exams.

Q: B35

The single sanction is too drastic and led me to avoid bringing an incident to anyone's attention.
The criteria for convicting a student are too stringent. Faculty is regularly attacked in the attempt to clear the student (e.g., accused of racism, sexism).
Inability to find a student guilty with what I consider overwhelming evidence of clear cheating.
The process is enormously burdensome on faculty both in immediate time costs and in potentially subjecting faculty to litigation.
Students generally will not report other students for violations...its hard to see how the system can work if students will not report violations
Once the case is in the hands of the Honor Committee, things are handled quite well. On the other hand, there is an almost blind adherence to the single sanction by those connected directly with the Honor Committee that makes it difficult for them to improve the level of reporting of known offenses.
I have had several honor trials over a fairly long period. The most recent one (not the pending case) brought out unfounded accusations by the defense counsel against the accusing student. The defense counsel imagined himself to be on a TV program and attempted both intellectual and physical (body language) intimidation.
Fairness displayed for both parties involved (sexual harassment case). Always willing to give orientations to students, recent address of international student population.
I am not sure why I am being asked this question as I thought I indicated that I have never brought a case to the committee. My impression has been affected by the outcome of the student's) in the assault case who were the children of wealthy (FedEx) families and by colleagues accounts of their experience.
It is a system that almost forces a student to plead guilty, which in turn results in LONG court cases that can be disrespectful to the faculty member. In other words, the faculty member is on trial as a usually obviously guilty student and his law school friends try to finagle a retrial, mistrial, or not guilty verdict wasting everyone's time.
The unnecessary emotional turmoil produced in a student bringing an honor offense accusation - actually incapacitating in terms of the student's ability to concentrate on his studies. The offense was ultimately dismissed, but I will never forget the impact it made on the student. The single sanction escalated the importance of the outcome to a level totally discordant with the significance of the alleged offense, i.e., cheating on an exam. I consider the system medieval.
Disinterest in pursuing cases by Honor System officials.
The community of trust that results from the Honor Code.
I've seen student cheating here since 1970 and have noted the reluctance of students to bring charges, perhaps especially against their own fraternity brothers. The Honor Committee may try to deal fairly with the cases brought to their notice, but the judgment of seriousness seems to me deeply flawed, resulting in unfair decisions.
Seriousness and thoroughness of the Honor Committee in investigating honor cases in spite of the difficulties and limited resources available.
Two things: first of all, the procedures are cumbersome. The one time I used the Honor System, it took nearly the entire semester to finally be able to report back to the students what was happening (which meant not returning their midterm until then). But mostly, the single sanction is absurd. It's a 19th-century device based on a peculiar Southern notion of honor that has little relevance today. I'd much prefer a system that acknowledged different levels of cheating, different occurrences of cheating, and allowed these students (who are essentially moral people) the opportunity to understand what the University is demanding of them.
I took two similar cases to trial. The evidence was overwhelming in both cases, indisputable in my view. However, one case dealt with cheating on a quiz and the other with extensive cheating on a final. Were one to judge the seriousness by the impact on grades, the second case was by far the more serious. The first student was convicted and expelled (perhaps coincidentally, this student was an AA male) and the second student was acquitted (perhaps

<p>coincidentally, a Caucasian male). The cariousness of the system was astonishing. In the second case, I was forbidden to use a blackboard when testifying, although I thought it essential to a clear understanding of the evidence. The reason given was that no advance request was made, and one was not handy. My counsel had never suggested this constraint would be imposed, and I did not face it in the first case mentioned. I had also prepared handouts explaining the same material I wanted to illustrate on the blackboard, but I was not allowed to distribute them because they had not been cleared in advance by the Honor Committee. Again, I had no foreknowledge that I would be forbidden to use the handout. Counsel in the first case was very effective, whereas counsel in the second case was not.</p>
<p>I appreciate that the system is student-run.</p>
<p>I regret to say that I do not believe the student standards for the seriousness of an offense are as rigorous as faculty standards.</p>
<p>Single sanction, the fact that students get to arbitrate, and that their often immature or Lord of the Flies jurisprudence results in lasting harm to anyone brought before the Honor Committee. College in many ways is about learning from mistakes, and the Honor System is the worst aspect of academic life at UVA.</p>
<p>I feel the Honor System rewards honest students, and that is a good thing. I am happy that I can show my students I trust them by giving them take-home exams, etc. At the same time I do not think the Honor System keeps dishonest people from cheating. But it does let a lot of cheaters slip by with good grades because it puts the burden on the instructor. The instructor has already been burdened by the cheating--that's enough!</p>
<p>I was an undergrad and graduate student here. I appreciate the trust atmosphere.</p>
<p>A make-believe exercise.</p>
<p>The notion of a community of trust. Observing a representative talk to our new student during orientation. Witnessing my son praise the Honor Men.</p>
<p>I know a person who is involved in some panels. I am impressed how serious they take it - which is good. But at the same time it would make me hesitate to report because it might give too much weight to the case.</p>
<p>Testimony in Honor trial.</p>
<p>Student recanted the honor pledge on his own in the knowledge that he had committed an actionable honor offense. He submitted, in penance, new work that was his own. I have also been asked to advise TA's who suspected offenses (plagiarism), which I was able to confirm, students were ordinarily confronted and what happened next I did not wish to follow. My suggestion is always to adjust the remedy to the particular knowingness or naiveté and intentions (confessed or no) of the student (ignorance of the standard is some excuse, in this context). Some students have been trained, in high school, to cobble up work from that of published authors, and been encouraged to synthesize (without quotation marks or adequate citation) in a way that looks like plagiarism, at the college level. One needs to explain the problem to one's class early on, (and suggest solutions), especially if the class contains real beginners or the equivalent of rank amateurs.</p>
<p>Despite the idealistic intent of the system, in the cases I have been involved with--it doesn't work. The offenders do not respect the Honor System or the process and will use whatever resources (legal representation, or other advocates within the University) to disrupt the honor trial process. The student juries are unwilling to put forth a guilty verdict in the case of small incidents of lying, cheating, or stealing. Students in my experience are unwilling to report possible honor offenses and do not want to serve as witnesses. When this is the case the burden rests entirely with faculty or TAs to serve as witnesses for the case. In my experiences with the Honor System it has been a tremendous waste of time and energy on what are usually the worst students in the class. I would much rather spend that same time teaching, mentoring, and working with the students that want to put forth the effort to learn.</p>
<p>A presentation by an Honors representative on the system. The person doing the presentation did not seem especially bright; her presentation was poorly articulated and did not respect the intelligence of the (faculty) audience. She was totally unable to respond in a sophisticated way to questions in which faculty identified the weakest aspects of the system.</p>

The student-run aspects of the Honor System and the seriousness with which students accept the responsibility. The single sanction. The simplicity of the System allows it to work. The way that the Honor System is accepted as the foundation of our way of life, the Community of Trust.
Realities of the single sanction.
That students take it seriously. My own reaction is Duh! Honesty should be a 'given' at a university, and I get annoyed when students write on an exam that they have been honest and that it is their own work. (Can you imagine them writing otherwise?)
The trial of an accused former student, in an investigation that I launched, was conducted with fairness and professional comportment.
The reporting student went to an assistant dean and was advised to say nothing but to be alert to see if it happened again.
Student had large sections of the paper that were plagiarized. Honor Committee said she just didn't realize that she had no citation.
It has reinforced by concerns for the single sanction -- I know the theory behind it but I do not believe that there should be some middle ground especially for first offenders. After all we are an institution of learning and development.
I think it is a grandly abstract measure which fits into the history of the institution, but I don't think students have a concrete idea about why they sign the Honor Pledge, and what specific practices signing the Pledge entails. My impression is that students will work together on projects unless the instructor specifically prohibits students from doing so. If it isn't mentioned, some students seem to think that it's sanctioned.
My observations of the behavior of the honest majority of students lead me to continue valuing and using the system. Most of my observations of trials and investigations have convinced me that the standard of proof required for a conviction is almost impossibly high; combined with the long duration of an investigation / trial / appeal, it appears now that in nearly all cases of suspected cheating, it's simply not rational to make an accusation; and in most of the instances in which I'm sure cheating occurred, I knew enough about the burden of proof to conclude that I had no case.
The disconnect between student practice and the enforcement system.
My experience has not always been direct (the last two times I had direct experience involved encouraging two separate students to submit conscientious retractions - one did, one did not. I did not bring charges against the second because in her case, she was raped and she lied to avoid telling her instructors this detail) - but I have been very involved in the cases of other faculty members. When students were found not guilty despite obvious evidence, I felt that the faculty members who had initiated the cases were being told that they were not experienced or knowledgeable enough to recognize cheating. This is an insult to faculties who take the Honor System very seriously and expect its tenets to be upheld. It is the student body who does not take the System seriously so we faculty must, therefore, take things into our own hands.
How an alleged offense was processed.
I have come to respect the Honor System. I am a clinical faculty in the School of Medicine so I do not teach classes at all. My interaction is through patient care, so there are no examinations, tests, etc. I was the Medical Student representative to the Honor Council when I was a medical student here.
In my experience with a trial, all students involved were very serious and professional. It was quite impressive. Several experiences with the system have convinced me that it's hard to judge what is serious enough to merit the single sanction. I have concluded that having the single sanction leads to an unworkable solution, despite its good intention. The system needs more flexibility.
The several incidents of cheating that arose in my classes.
The lack of cheating in the classes.
Clear-cut rules and penalties.

Thoroughness of investigation into the honor offense, and understanding.
Interactions with student reps assigned to me. Some were very on the ball, some were not as good. In general they were good - at making meetings, describing the process, etc.
Students don't get convicted of clear cheating infractions.
I knew someone that was dismissed from the university and denied undergraduate degree for plagiarizing from the internet. It was a serious situation that needed attention but I didn't expect the student to be denied degree. I gained respect for the standard to which the Honor Code is upheld at this university.
The seriousness clause.
The students who administer the Honor System are first rate. They are careful, thoughtful, and have the best of intentions. The single sanction system is philosophically consistent with the values of the institution, but it fails the test of practicality.
While I am always impressed by the intelligence and sincerity of the Honor Committee, I believe they are off in a fantasyland of worship for the single sanction, not realizing that in fact the single sanction causes students and faculty alike to tolerate cheating, rather than turn students in, or convict them once turned in. So, cheating at UVA pays. It's so easy to do, and so unlikely to lead to any punishment.
I think it is clear from my previous answers. I do think the single sanction is a problem. It is the reason why students do not convict. I also think this is an education institution and the single sanction leaves no room for education.
Cheating on homework for certain types of courses is never viewed as reprehensible I believe some student groups are over represented for cases that go to trial
I think the Honor System is useful to give the university a cultural identity based on character and integrity. As a means to prevent student cheating, it's utterly foolish. It is a weak deterrent at best. Students who are likely to cheat will take advantage of the students who do not cheat, exploiting their ignorance on incomplete knowledge to obtain a better grade. Given the proper context students are placed in circumstance similar to a 'Prisoner's Dilemma' in which an individual's breach of cooperation for his own selfish motives can be rewarded (should he succeed) while those that cooperate lose out. Given the single sanction, it is less likely that students will enforce the sanction against their peers. Furthermore, it gives instructors a false sense of security that their students won't cheat. However, another positive aspect; instructors have a fallback so that if all their stratagems to stop cheating fail, they are not liable for failure to curb cheating, as the students are made accountable for their actions individually and collectively for cheating. Or should teachers be more active in curbing cheating?
It seems that students don't take it as seriously as the university takes it -- I come from a smaller university where the Honor Code was extremely serious, and the small community took the Honor Code very seriously. I think the size of the university here at UVA makes it such that the code itself loses some of its efficacy insofar as many students feel very far removed from the enforcement of it.
There is a sense of trust among students and teachers.
Most students seem to take it very seriously and want to live up to the code. They want their work and learning to be due to their own effort.
Teach students to be a good person.
Having a friend be dismissed for what I thought were unsubstantial reasons. I also served on a jury and saw the process work; a student who plagiarized was dismissed, and I left the trial thinking that this punishment was rather harsh, and maybe unfair that it was decided by students.
Served as Honor Juror.
As an undergraduate student, I was part of a group brought up on honor charges by a person affiliated with a landlord from whom I no longer rented property. No effort had been made to determine if the landlord had any basis for bringing charges before I and other students were subjected to a hearing. The lack of process was disturbing.



Q: B35

Hearing about the trials (people are afraid to enforce the single sanction - more offenses aren't serious enough to enforce that). Telling a professor that a student was blatantly cheating on an exam, and being told that he didn't want to go through the process of bring up charges.
That it consists of a body of students and not faculty.
The students who work for the System were competent.
It was an emotionally trying experience -- I'm not sure it's worth going through this again unless I have rock solid evidence. Unfortunately, I've heard stories to the effect that even those cases that have rock solid evidence are still rejected, and more cases that appear to have flimsy evidence result in a conviction.
There have been several cases, including some high-profile cases, in which the accused were clearly guilty and yet they were allowed to remain at the University. This calls into question the integrity of the Honor System. I have also heard of a few cases where the accused was dismissed, however the cases where justice does not prevail have a much larger effect on my perception of the Honor System.
I have not personally been involved in an honor trial - but I know TAs that have and they have almost universally been disappointed. The severity of the infraction rule makes it difficult to convict students, even of clear crimes.
That I can trust my students to be respectable adults.
Being on a jury for an Honor violation made me realize how difficult it really is to get someone who obviously cheated to be punished, it's not a majority vote, as I had expected. Knowing that athletes have access to databanks of papers and assignments made me lose respect for the Honor Code. I realize that this is not officially endorsed, but I understand that faculty often looks the other way.
I was called to be a juror and asked to fill out a form with ridiculous questions. Asking me if I can fulfill my duty as a juror without prejudice and then asking me all the things I may be prejudiced against is an ontological. Of course ALL people have prejudices and NO ONE can say they don't. If this weren't so, your survey would look differently. All you can do is ask if people can set aside their biases and interpret a set of rules. The system itself encourages historically clear biases through the structure of the committees who oversee it.
In the one experience of bringing the activities of a student to the attention of the Honor System, I found that the timetable for meetings and hearings was continually evaded by the student and that the system didn't enforce a time limit on responses. The whole process unfolded well beyond the standard time frame and didn't get on track until nearly a year later. I was also taken aback at the lack of consideration of what seemed incontrovertible evidence in the ultimate findings of the jury as were the students who were directly involved in prosecuting the case (we were all in something of a state of disbelief). This was my only direct experience with the Honor System in roughly 12 years on the faculty at UVA. On the other hand, I greatly admired and appreciated the dedication and heart-felt engagement in the process that those students who were responsible for the system had. Their demonstrated interest and sense of fairness was very inspiring.
The institution of the Honor System made doing assignments for one of my classes very inconvenient. There are honorable ways to do schoolwork in pairs or groups. Some professors may or may not realize it.
I found the professionalism of the Honor Committee to be questionable, and such a circumstance is inexcusable given the high stakes for accused students.
Not being able to report an incident affected my impressions.
Students I have talked to about the Honor Code always are familiar with it, and are at the very least aware of its prohibitions when I talk to them about what constitutes plagiarism and cheating on my syllabi.
I think treating dandruff by decapitation is moronic. People aren't put to death for jaywalking for a reason. I think it's a shame that the so-called Honor System thinks the only tool in existence is a hammer and that the only problems to be solved look like nails. I expect better from UVA than a typical knee jerk reaction.

Q: B35

Took a long time to handle my one complaint - I have been on the Honor System side, so I was more understanding, but if I was a non-associated faculty member, I would have been pissed at how long it took a complaint to move forward (Spring 2005-Feb 2006)
The fact that the Honor Code is really emphasized right from the beginning and throughout the academic career at UVa. The history of the Honor Code, and the trust that it creates between student and faculty and townspeople is really quite extraordinary and inspiring.
Trust one another.
It's common knowledge that most guilty students aren't punished. I had clear evidence that students in one of my sections had cheated but the professor refused to back me up. Why? Partially because I don't think he wanted the bother, but also he'd tried reporting clearly guilty students to the Honor Committee and nothing ever happened. On the other hand it scares the hell out of my honest students. I don't know how many times I've had students rush back into the room in terror after leaving me their papers to sign that idiotic pledge. Now what good is that going to do? Do you seriously think that someone is going to go through the entire process of plagiarizing a paper and then have some sudden pang of conscience when the sign out the pledge. It's utter foolishness. The Honor Code scares good students but the bad ones know they can flout it with impunity. Also, I have a very negative impression of the people who administer the Honor System. Frankly, they strike as power crazed little strivers who're more concerned with how all this will look on their applications or resumes than they are with the human beings whose futures they're handling.
The positive climate it creates.
The fact that overall it really works.
The fact that many students in my department violate the Honor Code regularly on pledged assignments without any repercussions or apparent contrition.
I have a young faculty colleague who did the honorable thing by bringing a case against a small group of students. She worked closely with the Honor Committee rep & the Dept Chair, Assoc Dean, etc. She had very strong evidence against the students. This case has continued for YEARS and her career has been negatively impacted by the experience. It has been traumatic to her; the students apparently have more power than faculty in this situation. It's appalling to me to see a faculty member who did the right thing (very carefully and thoughtfully) be devastated by the experience as she has been.
I personally have never had an involvement in an Honor Code violation procedure. However, I know faculty who have, and my impression is that it takes a great deal of faculty time and effort, and can be quite distressful to faculty when they believe that little is being done to help them represent their case fairly. In addition, when appeals go from one year to the next it seems that those who have been dismissed, are just trying to wear down the system and get back in. There should be a limit to the time someone has to make an appeal, and the process should not go from one year to the next.
There seems to be no scaling of the punishments to make them fit the crime. If the crime is probably not severe enough to warrant dismissal from the University, then one of two things seem to happen when such a case is brought before the Honor Committee. Either, 1) the student is, in my opinion, wrongfully expelled for a minor crime, or 2) the offense is ruled not severe enough to require any action and instead of a reasonable punishment being levied, no punishment is used. This is wrong because some punishment should have been applied. Without a graduated series of punishments, proportioned to the severity of the crime, the Honor System will continue to be an ineffective judiciary system.
I served on an honor trial and I was impressed by how scrupulously and conscientiously all the jurors were. I thought the process was fair and impartial.
Most faculty members think the honor proceedings such a hassle that even if they saw a student cheating, they would not bother to report it for fear they would get wrapped up in having to attend a trial for the student in question. Instead, they just look the other way.
Absence of apparent cheating and atmosphere of trust and respect.
I knew people at my undergraduate school who would have taken advantage of an Honor System like the one here.

I was sure the student cheated, but I was never called to witness and I assume it never went to trial. If they didn't go to trial in such an obviously guilty case, they probably never go to trial - so why ever report an offense?
I think most of the students I work with respect the Honor System totally. I like how I feel that there is an agreement between the students and me that they know that they are supposed the respect the Honor System. If they don't they know the consequences. I think generally this works very well at all levels.
The arbitrary nature of the offenses that come under the jurisdiction of the Honor Code. The exorbitant amount of time it takes to actually pursue an honor offense ruling.
The aspect of my experience with the Honor Code that affected my impressions most were the ways in which investigations were carried out and cases presented.
The three instances of suspected cheating occurred while I was TA'ing in a large lecture class. There was not enough room for all students to take the test in the lecture hall so students were voluntarily allowed to take the test in the locale of their choosing. Poor students often chose to take the test elsewhere, and could easily have cheated on I.D. portions of the midterm and final by goggling literary passages in the library. Though the students were asked to pledge the Honor Code on their blue books, the portion of poor students who took the test elsewhere and received very high scores on ID's made me suspicious of the potency of the Honor Code at UVa.
I think it is a good idea for the students to be able to self report their errors before receiving any disciplinary actions. I think the general student body does respect the Honor Code, but I have very limited exposure.
Formal process with potential for action.
Despite the fact that the system has its failures, and despite the fact that I have not denounced students to the Honor Committee, I find the Honor Code to be a very valuable motivation for students and faculty to be honorable. Even if you don't denounce a student to the Honor Committee, if you use the Honor Code as an argument or an expectation, it helps you be fairer and it helps the students be more mature. If you discuss an Honor Code violation with one of your students, and you find a fair way of dealing with it without being unfair to the rest of the class, the teacher and the student learn to negotiate in a good environment for discussion. I find the idea of having the Honor Code a great help in my classes, as an educator and as a human being. It creates a very positive environment of confidence and trust in the community, and for the good or for the bad; it helps to create a more cohesive relationship between all the students and between the students and faculty. The fact that you can choose to report a violation is fundamental for a good understanding of the Honor Code, though.
The Honor System has made possible take-home exams and dealing with the occasional emergency or other problem that requires special consideration (e.g., illness during an exam). I can only recall one instance in nearly 40 years on the faculty that I suspected a student had lied about missing a class.
The process can be all too politicized. It is adversarial towards faculty members and lacks consistency. If the system is truly student-run, then members of the faculty, and especially of the administration, should be prohibited from interaction in the process, except perhaps in and expert witness type role.
Slowness. Lack of resolve to convict students because of single sanction.
I have personally taken two cases to the Honor Committee, both of which went to trial. Although I am certain that both students cheated, and there was certainly enough evidence to that effect in one of the two cases, both students were found not guilty. Participating in both the i-Panel and the trial itself was extremely time-consuming for me, and in the end, I believe that the students on the jury agreed that the defendants were guilty, but were hesitant to expel them from the University. I also discovered some months after the second trial (in which there was hard evidence of cheating) that one of the students on the jury was a friend of the defendant. Personally, I believe that the Honor System at UVa is a joke. Students likely to cheat on their coursework can rest assured that either the faculty will not

even initiate an Honor case due to the time and energy involved in pursuing the matter, or if they do go to trial, unless the offense is particularly heinous, their peers will likely find them not guilty because to do so would mean their expulsion from the school (something most student jury members would be hesitant to impose for what they judge to be minor offenses). The Honor System is a talking point for UVa to sell itself to prospective students. The University is no different than other schools in the sense that there will always be students who prefer to take shortcuts rather than invest a lot of hard work into their education. The Honor System may change the perception of cheating at UVa for some people, but it is my firm belief that it does nothing to change the underlying behavior.

The difficulty in getting convictions in math cases.

The last trial during the fall semester, 2005.

We have a student community that can largely operate with mutual trust derived from the honesty and ethical behavior demanded by the Honor System.

The magnitude of the single sanction, combined with my role as a teaching assistant, has made it very difficult for me to figure out how to act in the case of an honor violation in my classroom. TAs and Graduate instructors don't generally have the security and support that faculty members can rely on, and it's very difficult to know whether or not a TA is possibly guilty for not reporting an offense when the TA is both a student or teacher at UVa. In addition, the idea of the process being a long and drawn out one does not appeal at all to me as a graduate instructor. As someone writing a dissertation and teaching, having very little money and trying to finish my degree, I would abhor being involved in a lengthy legalistic process all because one of my students cheated. Finally, the constant references to tradition and honor on campus tours and in the Cavalier Daily seem somewhat smug to me; if anything, the single sanction seems to punish TAs and faculty at the University, because it puts a great burden on them by creating such a significant and life-altering punishment.

Time delays, single sanction, and lack of student experience in handling cases.

A recent case was handled very capriciously. My relationship with the convicted students leads me to believe that the conviction was unjust. Trial procedures seemed very bizarre.

Sense that infractions were never really punished.

The irresponsibility and immaturity of the student prosecutors was unsettling. They lost some of the material I gave them as evidence, were self-righteous at the trial, clearly relishing their opportunity to play the part of the attorney, (many were, after all, applying to law school), and misrepresented the procedure to me. I was told that I simply had to present the evidence to them and that they would take it from there. In the end, both my TA and I had to testify at the trial, thus confronting the student and his family in extremely tense and unpleasant circumstances. The parents wrote a letter to the head of the department accusing me of racism, although the evidence was incontrovertible and the parents themselves had a hand in assisting the student to cheat. The student was expelled, but one of his deans wrote a letter extolling his good character and that enabled him to transfer to Columbia. Hardly a punishment. The whole trial had been a farce, one that was not without consequences for me.

Outcomes of cases as reported in the media or by colleagues.

Positively: Student Honor System leaders are committed, intelligent students who give a great deal of their time and energy to running the System - their commitment is impressive. Negatively: Change is very difficult to make in the system, as it is fully student-run, and students leave after a year or two of involvement. Issues get recycled when new leaders come in, rather than resolved. The energy around reforming the Single Sanction cannot seem to be maintained, so that needed changes to the system don't occur.

Virtual absence of cheating in courses, although I teach small classes (<30 students).

Because of the effort required of faculty to bring honor charges, substantiate them, and see a case through a trial, I opted to fail the student who plagiarized (and admitted plagiarizing); this student was about to graduate and the F in my course, I believe, prevented the graduation at the end of that semester.

It is difficult being in the position of catching someone plagiarizing something but that the

<p>assignment itself is not worth getting kicked out of UVa for. It is like being in-between a rock and a hard place because the student needs to understand that what he did is unacceptable, yet it, at times, doesn't seem reasonable to get them kicked out of the university for the infraction (in the cases I've dealt with). Yet, I'm fairly sure these students are doing it in other classes too, so it makes me want to make the message clear. It is tough.</p>
<p>The unwillingness of my colleagues to pursue charges against an admittedly guilty student made me loath to press charges myself. Also, I don't believe the students believe in the Honor System. I'd rather punish the student myself.</p>
<p>Students take it seriously.</p>
<p>The Honor System works like a court of law, with all of a law court's susceptibility to shrewd procedural maneuvering and theatricality. Even where a preponderance of evidence supports conviction, a student who has access to professional (or semi-professional) advice and representation because of family or athletic department resources can avoid conviction on various grounds such as offense was not serious; they were not made sufficiently aware of honor policies or definitions of offences; they were unable to assimilate information about honor standards; etc. They can play dumb, fake it, and game the system quite easily. Unfortunately, students who are conscientiously admitting guilt or that they understand the complaints made against them can easily be expelled from the university for offenses far less serious than those less ethical students can get dismissed.</p>
<p>Students who plagiarize rarely seem to be published in my experience.</p>
<p>Instructors understand that cheating has to be nearly beyond blatant to be worthy of reporting. It seems that the odds of proving guilt are nearly zero. Time can be much better spent elsewhere.</p>
<p>A student who was clearly guilty (by confession) was allowed to graduate. It is difficult to have confidence in the system.</p>
<p>When I was a graduate student here I served on a jury. The single sanction is silly, since most juries will not convict for even an egregious infraction. If there had been another sanction in our case, we would have done something since the people were clearly guilty of cheating. Since the only option was to destroy their lives, we voted to acquit and basically made the accusers look like idiots.</p>
<p>It seems that signing the Pledge for quizzes and exams is nearly meaningless. Students who want to cheat will cheat whether or not they sign the Pledge.</p>
<p>The single sanction is ridiculous. The student management of it makes it ludicrous.</p>
<p>Talking to undergraduate students. I think the Honor System works well within the medical school where there are few papers and the tests are all coordinated, so there is little opportunity for cheating. However, after talking to some undergraduate students, it is clear that there is a lot of cheating in the form of plagiarized papers and people leaving exams to get answers.</p>
<p>The main exposure I have had with the UVa Honor System was this past year when Medical Students (who had been undergraduates at UVa) brought the Honor System to the attention of all faculty at the Dean's Faculty Meeting. The students were well spoken; they explained the Honor Code simply and clearly. I was impressed by the fact that this Code continues to live and affect the lives of students especially at post-graduate levels.</p>
<p>The advice and counsel of the full time honor employee.</p>
<p>Students appear to take it seriously, often pledging their work, even though I don't ask them to. Believing that the Honor System works has allowed me to be more flexible as an instructor, and to teach with the assumption that students are not looking for ways to submit an assignment for which they have not done the work themselves.</p>
<p>UVa is somewhat overzealous in spreading information about the Honor Code among faculty. A simple brochure or website would be useful in case of need.</p>
<p>It is a pervasive, well-known, and relatively well-respected tenant.</p>
<p>I feel that by having an Honor System that it reduces instances of cheating, lying or stealing, as students are required to accept responsibility for their own behavior.</p>

Honor jury members have little or no knowledge of how to think logically and evaluate evidence. There are too many interviews for fact finding by various honor advisors, etc. It is clear from the questions asked that these people have had no training in investigation procedures, how to evaluate evidence, etc. Honor juries have taken many statements of the accused to be true without any investigation. For example, if the student says I did not intend to cheat, this has been accepted as a truth on that basis that an UVa student would not lie! I am not making this up! Here sits a student accused of cheating and whatever he or she says at trial is taken to be the honest truth. Here is a real example: The student has submitted a numerical answer to questions on an exam and these numbers agree exactly with those of another student on more than one question, agreement down to five decimal places, and when the exam was designed so that each student had a different set of starting numbers. The student claims that he must have pushed some buttons on his calculator wrong and thus somehow ended up with the same numbers. Honor jury says that is certainly statistically possible. Decision is that there is not sufficient evidence.

Reluctance to impose the single sanction - allows serious offenses to go unpunished.

In order for an Honor System to work effectively, one must have a huge critical mass of honorable individuals who value honor, truth, and integrity over grades, success, and popularity. In the society in which we live and in particular the high achieving, yet morally drifting society in which our students come from, I believe it is the height of naiveté to think an Honor System can work well. What does happen is that there is a fair amount of cheating on the undergraduate level that is not caught, and those individuals who adhere to the Honor Code are at a double disadvantage if there are inadequate safeguards (other than the Honor System) to prevent cheating. As medical faculty and one who gives almost no exams I do not see cheating; however, I know that it does exist on campus from a variety of student sources.

Compelling evidence of flagrant cheating roundly ignored by juries that view cheating as part of the game.

The trial in which I participated as a defense witness.

My experiences of it as a student for eight years before becoming a faculty member.

A joke. Inconsistently applied. Outrageous cases not convicted. Ridiculous cases taken to trial that should have been summarily dismissed. I have been here since 1971. It meant something then. Now students who cheat assume (correctly) that even if caught they have a good chance of getting off. I treat my students as honorable. Not because of the Honor Code, but because I think they should be treated as adults. This is probably a mistake and if I taught 1st or 2nd year classes, I would be more cynical and would certainly proctor exams and look for cheating.

Faculty (or student) initiating the honor violation were treated as the guilty party. Faculty were criticized for having taken preventative actions for example, scanning copies of completed exams before they were returned to students after having been graded. The scanned copies provide a back-up for the student in the event they lose their original exam, but also provide faculty with documented evidence if a student changes an answer after the exam has been graded and then requests that the faculty change their grade to reflect the added answer. In the instance where a colleague initiated an honor trial using a scanned exam as evidence, the case was dismissed and the student found to be innocent because scanning the exams eliminates a presumption of innocence. After hearing about this experience, and having literally spent hours dealing with openly hostile honor advisors, parents and administrators, I personally decided that except for the most compelling reason, I would not bring a case to the Honor Committee again.

The Honor Committee does not seem to think that copying / cheating on computer programs or assignments is really cheating. I disagree.

Inviting Honor representatives to all my first year classes to review plagiarism issues. Very impressed by the presentation.

Single sanction for all cheating cases may be too harsh.

Students will not report cheating. They tell professors and expect professors to initiate the

case. Students also will not become witnesses, wanting to be anonymous. It doesn't feel like it is really something the students own or takes responsibility for. They want to take tests away from class but won't turn each other in.

The single sanction is rarely enforced and therefore discourages reporting an honor offense without sufficient evidence. If more sanctions were available then perhaps more honor offenses would be reported when lesser evidence is available.

The jurors, especially female members, are very reluctant to convict a defendant even when there is enough evidence of Honor Code violations because of the severity of the penalty. In the trial in which I participated, the Honor Committee members who conducted the trial, told lies to the jury during the deliberation and those lies favored the defendant. I was not sure during the deliberation that what the Honor Committee representative had told us was true or not, but I thought that what he said was very unlikely. After the trial, I verified the lack of veracity in what the Honor Committee representative had said during the deliberation. When the jury cast their votes, the Honor Committee representatives hide to count the votes and did not make possible to the jury to verify their count.

On one occasion I had a student advisee who was brought up on an honor offense of cheating - in my mind it was a technicality. She received minimum counsel and was found guilty. She was going to appeal, but unfortunately the exam period had begun and, since the system is student-run, she could not get a retrial within the time she would have to make a decision to apply to another school. I personally addressed a letter to the Honor Committee on the matter and never received a reply.

I experienced mostly as a student, as I don't give exams to my students. Not being a student here previously, I was worried that the Honor System would be very different to what I was used to. But it isn't.

My view is that the single sanction, together with the fact that trials are run by students, make the entire process unreliable as an indicator of guilt and as a way of meting out proper punishment.

The degree of support available to the student given the single sanction punishment requires such compelling evidence that cases of honor violations related to lying, cheating and stealing need to be proved at so high a level students can skim under the radar easily. Makes it tough to prove a faculty's position. Much easier to handle through grading since these students will use the material inappropriately.

The arbitrariness of the system.

The investigation was slow and unprofessional; the students on trial committee are not representative of the broader student body.

I have had colleagues of mine report students with clear, convincing, written proof of cheating and yet the students were found not guilty. I have also read about the farce of a trial last semester whereby cheating on part of an assignment was deemed not serious enough to warrant conviction.

Simply the knowledge that a student cannot take a lesson from violating the rules and, after some period of punishment, return to the university community, impresses me as wrongheaded and counter-productive. I would have turned the student (and another cheating student, some years before) in to the Honor Committee if it had not been for the foolish and excessively punitive nature of the single sanction. A university should be an institution that teaches, not one that punishes without hope of a student's self-improvement.

Though I know not all students are 100% honest, I give all of them the benefit of the doubt, and I believe that they honor me in sticking with the guidelines I set out and in two cases where suspicion was the case, I spoke with the students and was convinced that intentional cheating had not taken place - it only looked that way. In the case where there was actual cheating, the students reported it to the Honor Committee, but I never heard another word. She got an F, because I never heard from her either.

My observation was that the University treated {NAME} incredibly badly during his large-scale cheating incident several years ago. My impression prior to this was that the University should stand behind its faculty in Honor cases. This was not the case with {NAME}.

I was dismayed that one of my students, accused of an Honor Offense by a non-University person, was initially found to warrant a full Honor Trial for an offense that I and other faculty colleagues thought was not an offense at all. After an appeal to the full Honor Committee, however, a new hearing was held and the accusation was dismissed--as it should have been.
Going through a long arduous process. Seeing both my case and another case of a colleague not upheld due to ridiculous defenses. Note that both these experiences are somewhat old. Current system may function better.
Single section, selective targeting of minorities, secret trails by immature and perhaps racist students hardly engenders any confidence in the Honor System.
I served on an honor trial jury a few years ago. Complete farce, I can't believe that's how the system works. The advocates were playing Perry Mason and the jury members were too afraid to voice their opinions.
The committee's seems very reluctant to convict, especially in lying cases.
I served as a juror in an honor trial, and came away reassured of the fairness of the proceedings.
I have seen several instances where the Honor System case went off the tracks though there were strong signs of a violation. On occasion the law school has then had to try to make up for this by dealing with signs of dishonesty in other ways, such as dean's certifications to applicants for admission to the bar. I attribute the system breakdowns that I know about to the unrealistic devotion to the single sanction, and the overdone set of technicalities that have sprung up, in part, to compensate for the harshness of the single sanction.
Not as a TA, but I know a fellow student who was tried and I don't see he was punished, as he should have been.
I cannot say exactly what my impressions are at the moment since my experience with Honor is ongoing. However, the Honor case that I am involved with is from my perspective and from the perspective of the professor involved to be a very serious violation. It was this and the fact that there was a large amount of evidence in the case that caused us to bring it to Honor. If there had been any less evidence then the case would probably not been reported, this strike seems as very problematic. Second, while the demands on my time due to the Honor process have been relatively light, the demands on time for the professor involved in the case have been much heavier. I do believe the Honor advisors with whom I have had contact with have done their job well and so I do not think that the problems that exist with the Honor System have anything to do with the people who administer it. Rather, I think the problem lies in the time commitments that professors and TAs must put into Honor cases when they bring them and the extremely high levels of evidence needed to even bring a case that has the possibility of being prosecuted.
I have never been at a University with an Honor System and therefore have been impressed with the concept and seriousness.
Student compliance with pledge signing.
Before being a tutor at the Athlete's department, a member of the Honor Committee gave us all an introduction, clear, concise and very much convincing.
Hearing people talk about the Honor Code indicates that it is an active part of the university.
The process of reporting honor infractions is too time-consuming. And especially on in-class exams, it is difficult to prove that someone has cheated.
As a graduate student, I have been encouraged to participate in the Honor System both as a student and as a TA. However, once my interview was over I was completely shut out of the process. I have no idea what went on after my interview, only that the charges were dropped. My goal in starting the case was to help the student, because it was clear that something was wrong. Currently, I do not know if they are being helped or not, I don't even know if they are still at the university.
I think students use the Honor System as permission to cheat.
I have never liked the idea of having to pledge individual pieces of work. The Honor System applies to students regardless of whether the pledge is written out on an exam, paper, or



<p>other assignment. I believe that asking a student to write the pledge out is demeaning. Although it is meant to create an environment of trust, it really seems untrusting. It says to the student: I don't trust that you are capable of acting honorably on your own. That said, I did find some comfort in the Honor System as a TA. Because the punishments for violations are so harsh, I felt that I didn't need to worry about students cheating or lying to me about special circumstances.</p>
<p>In learning more about it, I realized that the penalties were far more serious than I thought. It was positive to see that it is taken so seriously by the students and University. But I also gained the impression that the verdicts rendered by the Honor Committee are not particularly objective, so that was negative.</p>
<p>I have both very positive a very negative experiences with the Honor System. I enjoy the community of trust and I have been frustrated by specific experiences with the Honor Committee.</p>
<p>I think it is pretty fair. It sets a high standard for people, and people are strongly reinforced to try to do the right thing because there is a big penalty, which cannot be undone.</p>
<p>I think the students making lifelong decisions do not have the life experience to understand the consequences of their judgments. I think the Honor System, probably unchanged for many, many years fails to consider the pressures and complications of today's students.</p>
<p>I think that the punishment is sometimes very hard.</p>
<p>Single sanction and criteria of seriousness.</p>
<p>Students seem o have internalized the Honor System. I don't have to remind them of it and they seem to enforce one another.</p>
<p>Handing out an exam without proctoring it is asking for students to work together and thus per definition cheat. We should redefine cheating and not put students into situations where they might work together even though they are not supposed to. Why not even assign tests where they should actually work together? And in exams have somebody monitoring the students and in case needed be strict. Not necessary dismissal from the university but rather fail the class. I believe teaching has become too lax.</p>
<p>Several years ago in summer session there was, to me, indisputable evidence that three athletes in the class had copied from another student on an exam. No charges were ever brought by the Honor System, which suggested to me that their athletic prowess was a major factor in how the case was handled.</p>
<p>It is clearly very difficult to get a conviction, and the one case I brought to trial did not result in a conviction, for rather peripheral reasons. Nevertheless, I believe the fact of the trial tended to discourage similar future cheating, and I overall think the Honor System has a very positive effect.</p>
<p>The professionalism and dedication of many of the students within the system is impressive.</p>
<p>Students behave dishonorably. If they think they can get away with something, they will. Their word is no good, and teachers will not use the Honor System because it has serious backlashes on them (student retaliation).</p>
<p>I feel that the students just sign the pledge because they have to. They don't abide by the rules. It's just a part of being a UVa student. I am a TA for a lab course in which the students work in groups of three. They have a lab manual and all three students work together and discuss their responses to the questions before they write their answers down. For the first lab this semester, without me saying to do so, everyone in the lab wrote the pledge at the top of their reports and signed it. They wrote, "I have not received aid on this assignment" etc., when in fact they all did help each other. None of them asked me if it had to be pledged. Since then I pay absolutely no attention to the Honor Code, and the so-called pledge. From my experience the undergraduates are oblivious to what they are doing, and just do it because they have to.</p>
<p>I was put on trial rather than the student. Moreover, the trial itself was run in a ridiculous manner: I was not the person who reported the violation, my TA was. He was the most familiar with the issues. Yet they did not question him, nor would they let me confer with him to answer questions about which he, not I, was familiar. Worse, they would not even let my</p>

<p>TA be in the trial room. On the other hand, the defendant was allowed to have a witness, who already had left the university, TELEPHONE IN testimony to take all of the blame to save the defendant. Truth was not a goal here. The truth was railroaded by the attorney for the defendant, who was a graduate student in law, while my representative was a first year student who was cowed by the jury (which was, as far as I could tell, mostly law or pre-law students). The whole affair was laughable, if not sad and a waste of my entire day.</p>
<p>The students involved in running the Honor Committee spend a great deal of time on cases and take their responsibility quite seriously.</p>
<p>Although it's very time-consuming, it's also very professionally run. I would be happy to have either the prosecuting or defense students at the honor trials I attended be my lawyer. They were very prepared and did a great job. That was the fun part. The exasperating part is hearing a student of mine who cheated continue to lie about it at the trial.</p>
<p>The reverence with which students regard their duty to conduct themselves with integrity.</p>
<p>It seems that no one can be convicted of cheating without a clear eyewitness to the infraction, and technicalities such as mentioning a document in a bibliography excuse a student from cheating if they quote extensively in their paper from that document without citing it. I feel that, because of the single sanction, the requirements for a conviction are very hard to meet.</p>
<p>I have been involved in two cases that went to honor trial. The first one, I was a grader for someone else's class - (I received two papers that were identical). This case went to trial. I had to testify. It was traumatic for everyone involved, and in the end, I think the wrong student was punished. In a second case, I was called as a witness for a student who was falsely accused by another student. In this case, the student was not found guilty, but ultimately withdrew from UVa anyway. Again, the case was long, drawn out, poorly handled, and traumatic for all involved.</p>
<p>Student in tears said a student who was triple charging recruiting companies after he already had a job just to go to NYC and then told her he'd beat her up if she told anyone. This case was referred to the Honor Committee and later the student graduated. That's to me, lying, cheating, and stealing and I was very disappointed. The rules about what is reprehensible or sanction able often seem very self-serving to students, AND I'm glad we have the Honor Code and it makes it better than at other schools. I think our cheating is less than at other places.</p>
<p>Inactions taken after another TA reported cheating to the Honor Committee. The trial found that the students were not guilty of cheating, but it was clear as day to all of the TAs who were aware of the incident in question. It seems to me that those students who will break the Honor Code will do so and will have no problems pledging their work and those who will not violate the Honor Code don't need the constant reminders of pledging their work.</p>
<p>Being a student, I always heard negative things about the Honor System and how harsh it sometimes is. But during my appointment as a TA, I could see things from a teacher's perspective and realized how important integrity is. We not only want to have and train students to solve problems, but we also want them to have a sense of ethics, being able to decide what is right and what is wrong.</p>
<p>I really like the principle that students are honorable and that what they say can be believed to be true.</p>
<p>People take it very seriously, so I think it is a positive influence on students.</p>
<p>The difficulty of obtaining a conviction.</p>
<p>I think it is a great thing to have instated. Most students take it very seriously, which I think is very important overall in life.</p>
<p>An overall sense that the faculty does not support it -- or turn students in when they need to. I've known star athletes, for example, outside of the classroom, who considered cheating "business as usual" and told me that their trainers provided tutors to help them with their work. The students in question seemed to think that special rules applied to them, as prominent athletes, and they did not have to take the Honor Code seriously. I myself went to a small ivy-league college that had an Honor Code and seemed to enforce it. During my</p>

time at college, several students were kicked out for cheating, and they were white students from wealthy families. I get the impression that black students may be judged more stringently here in comparison to their white counterparts. But it is disappointing to see honor taken so lightly. We seem not to be considering the societal consequences of condoning or looking away in the face of dishonorable behavior. Many professors here say that they are not here to teach morality. And yet we teach lots of things besides our own subject matter. Requiring students to hand assignments in on time, or courteous behavior in discussions, for example, are things that we promote and condone and therefore teach in the classroom. It seems that we should do the same for lying, cheating and stealing.
The presence of the Honor System pervades all experiences here at UVa and has a very positive impact as a result.
The general maturity which undergraduate students show when considering Honor System issues.
The self-policing implications of the Honor System are most impressive. It exerts formidable moral suasion on the UVA community.
I think the single sanction biases the Honor System to be overly cautious in what cases are brought to trial. Because there's a nontrivial time commitment to bring a case to trial, I can't use the Honor System as a tool as often as I could. As a result, students have less respect for the Honor System. The students involved with the Honor System do a great job and I wish more of the student body would take their involvement seriously and initiate cases.
I work with graduate students - they take the Honor Code seriously.
Posting code in all classrooms.
I observed a student enthusiastically reporting an honor violation by an athlete. This was several years ago. I was surprised by the attitude of the reporting student, and his pleasure at being able to accuse a prominent student.
The Honor System seems to have become a part of the culture at UVa...it's visible, it's integral, and it just seems not to be questioned.
Time consuming for the professor. All students have been acquitted despite clear evidence to the contrary. I suppose this has to do with reluctance to apply the single sanction.
The expectations of the Honor System establish a culture of academic honesty and integrity. Establishes a way of life for the student both in the University and after the person leaves.
I think that the single sanction, though idealistic, in practice leads to the sanction not being applied in some cases--either not reported or a not guilty finding--because the sanction is seen as so devastating and possibly not warranted given the behavior. Though lip service is paid to the system, it is not clear to me that there is a broad internalization of it as an elevated and meaningful code of behavior.
The students on honor who I dealt with have been very professional. That said, I do not support the single sanction one iota.
Watching how the jury follows the professor's testimony and the inherent power that has.
I felt the case was strong but was told not to continue.
I think the Honor System drives the fact that people don't cheat, especially in undergrad students.
I believe that the existence of the Honor Code, creates a clear expectation that students neither give nor receive help on assignments and that alone sets up the expectation that students are likely to adhere to.
It's somewhat of a joke. The line between cheating and not cheating is blurry, especially in the E-School. It's not necessarily the faculty's fault. The Honor Committee should educate students on clear guidelines for cheating.
I was present at a workshop about the Honor System given by members of the Honor Committee. My negative impressions are really of some students and colleagues more than of the Honor Code itself. I believe that in order for the Honor System to be effective, it must have the support of members of the University Community; the laissez-faire attitude of some members of that community toward what I view, as serious dishonorable conduct is

repulsive. One professor in my department advised me not to worry about cases of cheating on quizzes, saying that wasn't as big a deal as cheating on exams or papers I regularly hear students complaining about the stringency of the Honor Code as it regards things like fake I.D.s and the posters indicting the single sanction policy betray attitudes toward Honor Code infractions which undermine the set of values which forms the very foundation of the Honor Code in the first place.

Serving on a jury showed just how hard it is to get people to take the step to convict even when evidence seems overwhelming. This is a consequence of single result of dismissal.

I found the students standing in judgment to be competent and well versed in the relevant rules. They asked insightful questions and reigned in the advocates when they became overly excited. The defense advocate was horrible. His vision of the judicial process seemed more informed by the conduct at celebrity trials than anything else.

It is good to promote responsibility on the part of the student. But in my experience, the teacher is at least partially responsible for promoting cheating by giving the kind of assignments which invite it -- take-home exams, book report style papers, etc. I don't think we should lean on the Honor Code or test the limits of a student's honor. But creating an environment where original work is valued is up to the teacher.

The process of electing honor officials seems to be over politicized. While I agree that a democratic election is the best way to go, there must be some reform to insure that politics are taken out of the system. I have two years experience as a member of the Honor board at my undergraduate institution and this has taught me the importance of fitting the punishment to the crime. The single sanction is a hindrance to the prosecution of honor cases because if an offense is not judged to be of sufficient severity, the accused are let off with a slap on the wrist and no tangible punishment. However, in my experience, a gradient of punishments is very effective. That being your first offense you are found guilty of, you immediately fail the class, with various other punishments that increase in severity correlating with the seriousness / repeat nature of the offense. This system produced a very low repeat-offender percentage. The single sanction is also intimidating to faculty members who may deem that the offense doesn't warrant a punishment of that degree, or, conversely, by faculty members who use a small offense to wage their (often personal) battles with students. From really any angle the single sanction is viewed from, it serves neither teachers nor students and harms the community of trust that we work so hard to build. The institution must take steps that began with the voting down of the consensus clause to create a fairer system of punishment, one in which the punishment fits the crime, a tenet used as the basis on every reasonable legal system. The financial holdings of the Honor Committee are worrisome. An organization such as the Honor Committee already wields an amazing power and the fund that they have should support merely their operating cost, with any other funds being controlled by a third party. The fact that an already powerful body has control over a quite large amount of funds at a public institution is not only cause for anxiety for the students and faculty of the university but also is problem for the appearance of the honor board.

Totally a student-to-student procedure.

Those violations under administrative process are highly publicized. This is a good thing.

The first year I came to work for the University students were aware of the Honor Code, and they would ask me if they needed to sign their homework.

I admire and appreciate the community of trust on campus and the values it promotes.

Student respect for how it works, and how much they value it.

The finality of the sanction, and the way students take hold of the responsibilities involved.

I am an honor advisor so I am relatively familiar with the system. Actually dealing with students going through the process does make me question the single sanction. Granted, often times the cases do not go through the complete process or end up in a guilty verdict, but the idea of permanent dismissal is daunting. The seriousness / triviality question is very important.

It puts the responsibility of being honest on the student and I think that they do rise to the expectation.

Honor Code is an ideal, which has no validity to my eyes today. So are students cheating, destroying a book, stealing stuff from libraries?
I am a STRONG supporter of the Honor System. However, one of my TA's caught a student trying to hide a second bluebook that was filled with notes verbatim from the book and answers to the previous year's exam. The defense counsel (also a former student of mine) told me his only hope was to get minority representatives on the panel, and despite what I viewed as overwhelming evidence of guilt (the student claimed that she had written the notes in the bluebook she tried to conceal after the exam began so she would not 'forget' things she had memorized, but even with those extensive notes she barely passed the exam - and, combined with the exam she turned in, she would have written about 50% more than any other student did during the exam), the panel found her not guilty. I was disappointed, but have not lost faith in the system. {NAME} was found not guilty too. No system is perfect. Honor is too important to give up on.
The trial (or hearing) that I participated in as a witness was very adversarial. I felt like I was the one on trial. When I met with the honor advisors before the trial they told me a very different story about what would happen compared with what I experienced in the trial. I felt like I had been misled.
This goes back to when I was a student 20 years ago. Having the freedom to take exams in the library and being presumed honorable was a great experience. I have always wondered if the single sanction restricts people's ability to bring honor charges and wonder if some sort of a lesser offense for first time offenders might make it more useable. I do all of my teaching one on one in a clinical arena and therefore there is really no way that I can think of for someone to cheat on what I grade.
I was involved with an honor trial as a student. I was impressed with how well the trial was run.
The punishment (permanent dismissal) is too severe.
The development of trust.
The independence and confidence it builds in students.
In a case many years ago, I was asked three times to show up, when the defendant student or one of the student reps did not show up it was rescheduled again and again. I do not have time for that. Also, last year I made a deposition about students in my classes when another faculty member brought a case against them. They were clearly guilty but were still acquitted.
Acquitted student in trial who clearly had cheated. Honor System change so that other students are not obligated on their honor to investigate incidents that they observe that could cheat. It my opinion this change greatly weakened the system by removing the obligation of all students to enforce honorable behavior.
Complete incompetence of the students in charge (the case happened a long time ago, I believe it was 1985). They lost the book I gave them from which the case of plagiarism was taken. I never heard from them for the rest of the semester. When I inquired about the case, it appeared that no action was taken. The whole experience demonstrated that the student's) who represented the Honor Committee were incapable of paying serious and sustained attention to the case.
Single sanction - does it decrease reporting of cases? Certainly reporting of cases seems to be a significant issue. Lack of reporting undermines the system.
My perspective on this issue is philosophical. On the specific issue of the Honor System I am a skeptical. It is about ethics in today's world. The American academic elites are pretty much aligned with the economic and political elites. These elites are meritocratic and extremely goal oriented. Their approaches to Honor System and Honor Codes is puritanical - to put it mildly. The archetypical example of the application of the Honor System is the Service Academies. And when I see the product of their (Honor) system at work in the real world I am just astounded and revolted -- take a look at Ahbu Graib and Guantanamo. I also have reservations about being my brother's keeper, constantly observing him and judging his behavior and actions. Like an old fashion neighborhood committee for the defense of a

<p>revolution. My big reservation is that a sternly enforced Honor System will not have a long-term impact on the ethical conduct of our students, who by the way I have always found honest and forthcoming.</p>
<p>It is much talked about in principle, but details are unclear. Often students are explaining it to me, yet it is very relevant to the conduct of courses. Since I teach design studios, I am not often in the practice of setting exams, etc., where the system is more relevant. Additionally, I was an observer of several very negative episodes in Princeton's Undergraduate Honor Code while a graduate student, and nothing I have seen in Honor publications or presentations has convinced me that it is not susceptible to similar problems.</p>
<p>My student contact is limited to non-exam situations with medical students, since my teaching duties with them are limited to the apprentice style endemic in the clinical years of medical teaching. My impression, however, is that the lack of a graded penalty system makes student or teacher-based direct observations of cheating difficult and makes the handling of suspected cheating more difficult. That is what my colleagues in the class tell me. I, on the other hand, if I were in the position of observing medical students cheating, I would have little problem referring them to the Honor System because their postgraduate maturity makes them susceptible to a higher standard.</p>
<p>Single sanction. Time consuming.</p>
<p>I didn't have an experience myself, but the experience of {NAME} was incredibly demoralizing. I lost faith in the system after his very clear evidence of cheating was not affirmed, for most of the cases, by the Honor Committee</p>
<p>I observed one trial (about 7 years ago) and followed another personally. In both cases, the students responsible for prosecuting, administering, and judging the trial were grossly incompetent, immature, and unprofessional.</p>
<p>While I have not had to report anyone to the Honor Committee, I was part of case earlier. I was peripheral, but I witnessed the treatment of a graduate student who was called as a witness in a case, and the treatment of the graduate student WITNESS was literally reprehensible. While I respect the theory and integrity that began the Honor System, I do not have as much respect for the individuals who are either ill-prepared for trials or who suddenly decide they are Perry Mason when they try to put the wheels of honor in motion. The position often seems to mean more to the individuals involved than the trial, the outcome, and the LIVES of those who are involved.</p>
<p>Being able to trust the students.</p>
<p>There are many aspects of the Honor System, which, in my mind, render it absolutely obsolete. The fact that students who witness other students cheating are not required to do anything about it seems ridiculous. I understand that we are supposed to be operating in a community of trust, but it seems silly to assume that all students are going to understand what it means to be a member of such a community and know how to act accordingly.</p>
<p>The fact that it is utterly exhausting--and, quite frankly, worth no one's time, to ever go through with an honor trial.</p>
<p>The students' awareness of the importance of the Honor Code. Not all of my students, of course, demonstrated such awareness, but that some of them did seemed to me beneficial to the overall learning environment.</p>
<p>Although my area is clinical teaching and the focus is professional behavior, my impressions of the single sanction from my spouse is that it is rather harsh and applied unevenly. Students from other cultures and those who are not athletes often do not receive the same considerations as others.</p>
<p>Students do not seem to take it very seriously and many even feel that it makes it easier to get away with cheating.</p>
<p>I also attended UVa for my own undergraduate and graduate degrees, so I have extensive experience with the Honor System. I feel that it is an integral part of the University.</p>
<p>It appears to only rarely result in guilty verdicts.</p>
<p>In several instances over many years (some of which happened to colleagues) it seemed to me that ideas such as "not reprehensible" mean that cheating has to be really egregious to</p>

attract punishment.
Professionalism of honor reps.
The process is unnecessarily lengthy.
The single sanction is such an extreme response that I understand it to be largely irrelevant. Both students and faculty would rather deal with the offender personally than see them expelled for a minor infraction.
The only real experience I have had, since I do not teach in the University other than medical students and am not involved with their teaching is when I have been asked to be on panels in which a student is petitioning for a contributory mental condition in the commission of an Honor violation. It has been my sense that minority students are over represented among those who are accused and that this suggests a racial bias in the system.
The system is good in theory. The volunteers (honor reps) are very serious and know the procedures well. Unfortunately the remainder of the student body does not participate.
The lack of integrity among the student members of the Honor Committee. I was amazed to see who was on the committee and to think that he was questioning me about the veracity of my statement. It seemed as if the committee tried to confuse me, tried to make me doubt my own statements, so that they could decide in favor of the student. It felt rigged. And the wrong verdict was made.
It appears that some students are able to get away with major infractions while students who, sometimes inadvertently, commit minor offences are punished severely.
Community of trust Student support for the system.
I was also an undergraduate student here. I believe strongly in the single sanction Honor System
Serving on a trial committee, and serving as an alternate.
Serving as legal advisor to the Honor Committee.
I believe the Honor Code is an asset of the University. Discussing honor in class sets the right tone at the top.
That it is a multi-stage process and conviction of an accused student is difficult.
We believe students, being young adults, should be respected and responsible for their behaviors.
A student told me that she has regularly experienced the ability of herself and others being able to leave valuable unattended in the school buildings without loss of them.
Single sanction.
Most of the students who run the Honor System are dedicated and conscientious.
The lack of appeals, oversight, or consideration for mitigating circumstances.
I'm aware of three students that were dismissed (for good reason) from the University based on cheating on the final exam for my course.
The accused student was able to delay the process for nearly a year by not showing up for meetings and other stratagems. The procedures involved meant that the case dragged on endlessly, which was in no one's interest. The student prosecutors were medium-competent so I had to explain things to them quite a bit. The single sanction also clearly deters jurors from finding students guilty, which makes the whole process work less well.
Increased familiarity.
I was an undergraduate at the University and lived and breathed the Honor Code. Faculty trust and student conduct while an undergraduate were very different than my graduate experience in which foreign-student cheating was rampant.
For the most part I believe the Honor System fosters independence and honesty.
My experience is limited to observation of the way in which the Honor System functions at the University, through the press and conversations / discussions / debate among the faculty of the college of Arts and Sciences. My main concern regards the single sanction, which in my view has a very deleterious effect on the functioning of the Honor System.
The students in charge of the system take it very seriously.

As a prospective juror, I saw how time-consuming and burdensome any case would be for either side involved.
It seems that students are aware and respectful of the Honor System. Being caught cheating would really hurt one's reputation, and I think this is more of an incentive to not cheat than the threat of failing a class or being otherwise punished.
The way the students take it so seriously and pride themselves in that. Also, the way it has shaped what the university is all about. It is part of the UVa identity.
The professionalism with which investigations are conducted and the confidentiality of the process.
A very cumbersome and not always clearly accountable process of judgment.
All or nothing punishment is not necessarily appropriate. Sense of trust at UVa is high.
Serving on the Honor Committee.
To be honest in the exam.
The Honor System is a remnant of an old image of the University. I think even the term "honor" has an old south feel to it. Students need assignments that are meaningful, work that they want to do, and a culture that recognizes and encourages cooperation. I think many students don't know what citation means, and are unfairly punished. Others are pressured toward success. A few are slackers, or unscrupulous, but not many.
Completely unclear that matters were handled professionally or that the process is able to take care of most kinds of cheating.
The trial was very professional. It was clear that the students took their responsibility very seriously.
It seems to encourage professors to demonstrate a higher level of trust in students (than at other institutions). I feel freer at UVa to turn my back during an exam or even walk out of the classroom for a few minutes.
The interference of other faculty member to protect the student I knew had committed an honor violation. Since the student was the darling of these faculty members I was forced to sign a withdrawal form for the student in my class, although since I did not have much faith in the Honor System I had no intention of pressing charges. I even made it clear to the other faculty members that although I was certain about the honor violation I had no intention to press the charges. It was a nightmare for me to realize how a favorite student can be protected by the system despite the fact of involved dishonesty.
A colleague of mine had a watertight case of cheating involving three student athletes. His experience was a NIGHTMARE -- involving high time investment on his part; a farcical trial with ridiculous defense arguments, some of which put him unjustifiably put him in a bad light; resulting in acquittal for all. This colleague is a very hard working, very honest and fair member of the faculty who tried to play by the system. Never again were his conclusions. For my own part, I almost NEVER feel the infraction justifies permanent expulsion. It is an unworkable, anachronistic system that faculty have to put up with because idealistic naive students want to play at the judicial game. The resistance to putting cases forward, and the zeal with which they are defended, would both drop dramatically if there was a graded punishment system. There isn't a culture in the world that uses a single sanction -- for good reason -- why should UVa be so arrogant to think it is fundamentally different from all other cultures?
I knew someone who was a student attorney (or whatever it's called) for the Honor Court. He was very smart and capable. In general I have been so impressed with the seriousness and self-sufficiency of the way that the Honor Court is run. I love the Honor System. I like the fact that people take it seriously; it's not a joke. I believe that this is due to the single sanction. Please keep the single sanction! Otherwise, the Honor System will turn into nothing more than a corporate mission statement--empty words in service of a hollow idea that's taken seriously by no one. Here's my only negative impression of the Honor System: Two students were acquitted last semester for cheating in a course in my department. I knew the TA who accused them and I believe she has impeccable character. As far as I could tell those two students were guilty as {NAME}. But they got off: probably because



Q: B35

people don't have the guts to apply the single sanction. You have to take the good with the bad. I still think the Honor System is as good as it could be: the best thing at a pretty great school.
The recognition that most students behave as hoped, when trusted to do so.
Thorough review of the facts in the case.
My experience with the students and their appreciation for the Honor Code have uniformly been positive. I highly value being a faculty member at a school with student-centered honor governance.
I think that some professors might be more trusting of students not cheating on exams because of the Honor System (i.e. letting them sit right next to fellow students during exams). I still think a healthy degree of mistrust might be good, despite the instilment of the Honor System.
UVa students take the Honor Code System very seriously. They want to make sure that they are within the guidelines of the system.
I liked that the students were able to deliberate and decide what happened in the case. I haven't liked students lobbying for built in punishments as if they were trying to make sure the jurors were not too lenient or something.
I work for other universities that do not have an Honor Code. It impressed me as a UVa student and it impresses me as an adjunct professor.
Participating in the Honor System has lead to trust in the system.
Placing responsibility on the students rather than faculty.
Student investigator missing appointment. At trial, prosecuting students appeared to be seeking a conviction rather than the truth.
Several years ago I called the Honor System office about a student I had discovered who had plagiarized, and was told to just do whatever I thought was appropriate, that essentially it was up to me. I got the idea that the Honor people, whoever they were / are, didn't really care much about the process, that there weren't clear policies, that it was more talk than walk. On the other hand, I also felt torn between wanting to handle the situation gently and leniently, (i.e. my way, vs. having an automatic repercussion come slamming down simply because I spoke up). So I guess I'm a little confused about how I would want the Honor Code / system to work.
Case was delayed for many, many months. Student was convicted, but appealed and was allowed a second trial even though it was a clear, unambiguous, obvious example of plagiarism. Student was convicted a second time, but VP for Student Affairs seemed unconcerned about the cheating.
Those involved seem committed, organized, and fair. The system itself seems problematic. It should not be the responsibility of a faculty member to determine whether an honor offense has taken place. All questionable incidents should be reported, so that the Honor System can make that call. However, with the current system, this is not the way it works. First, there is single sanction, which very definitely deters faculty from reporting incidents. Secondly, the criteria for evaluating questionable behaviors are murky, subjective, and ill defined. Seriousness? Is that something that we, as instructors, should be responsible for determining?
I found that the honor advisors were not helpful. On two occasions I asked for advisor and the advice given was not helpful.
I find the two prior questions problematic. I do not have experience with the Honor System per se. I have experience with students in my classes. That indicates to me that a culture of honor is prevalent in my institution, the law school, whether due to the Honor System or other factors. That is all that I can honestly say.
This question is not clear. If you mean by experience, an investigation or trial my answer applies. If you mean that the Honor System suppresses cheating and that I can in general trust students I am very positive.
I would have preferred to answer this question with both somewhat positively and somewhat

negatively. My experience with an investigative panel was negative. My experience with the Honor Committee itself has been very positive.
Getting a conviction in very obvious cases is almost impossible.
The single sanction does not work because the students do not wholly embrace the Honor System. It is alien to culture of many (likely the majority) of our students. While I do not wish to live in a community that accepted honor offenses, the reality is that the honor offenses are not reported and we are no safer. I do not know if lowering the penalty for honor offenses would encourage even more cheating.
Several times our faculty have pursued cheating cases and in two instances with strong evidence of cheating the Honor Council failed to take action and attempted to explain the cheating as a misunderstanding of English or American culture. While this is a second hand experience, the impression in our department is that the Honor Council is unreliable and fickle.
Single sanction doesn't work in contemporary America; moral training is too lacking in society to make the move to the current Honor Code, as a First Year student is too large a jump.
I think the Honor System works well for those offenses reported. I also think it is very difficult to ensure that all students do their own work when the internet provides such easy opportunity for use of previous work done by friends, colleagues, and fraternity or club members. In the medical school, cheating is much more difficult to accomplish because so much of our assessment is Socratic or oral.
Before graduating and becoming an adjunct, I served as a member of an honor court jury. The process worked very well and I felt that the spirit was upheld. In my role as an adjunct, I teach classes that do not have exams or tests, and the nature of the assignments does not lend itself well to instances of cheating.
I felt that I was reluctant to report finding a student's cheating because of the extreme consequences of it.
I've not had occasion to send anyone up for Honor Code violations, in part because I design assignments for my writing classes that are near-plagiarism-proof (the person whose work is plagiarized would have to have sat in that particular section in order to write a paper that someone else could plagiarize for my class). But since the physics fiasco, I've taken note that the system as it stands is controlled by those who stand to benefit from bent rules and leniency. When someone is sent up, they get to plead a case and could possibly avoid consequences. If the person being sent up is part of the same fraternity or sorority or other social group as some of the committee members, other factors come into play regarding judgment that shouldn't bear on the decision. I feel set rules for certain cases without appeal would be a more effective way to keep students from cheating.
Years ago, when I was a new teacher at UVA, Professor {NAME} spoke to new professors about the system. What struck me most in everything he said were these words, still remembered: "As faculty members, you are very articulate and persuasive. Therefore, if you have any reservations about the Honor System, you should keep them to yourselves". This inhibition on our speech, on engaging intellectually with our students on any subject--especially one as important as this--was deeply troubling to me, both for what it said was expected of me as a member of the University community and for what it seemed to say about the perceived fragility of the Honor System, as if no articulate criticism of it were capable of being addressed. These comments instantly had the opposite effect from what I presumed was intended by the orientation: it made me want to have no part in the operation of the Honor System.
I can trust my students. They are responsible for their acts and I see that in their work.
Failure to convict students when the evidence was quite compelling. Also, decisions made not to even bring a trial when the evidence was rather compelling.
I can trust my students. They are responsible for their acts and I see that in their work.

Q: C2

**Q C2: What are your reservations about the level of support for the Honor System as it now exists at the University of Virginia? (Asked only of those who support the Honor System with reservations)**

Human nature is a difficult thing to mandate.
Unclear how well accepted and followed it is by students.
I am not sure it works.
Without knowing details or consequences. Need more information, and how does this apply to medical students or residents in post-graduate education?
I prefer various levels of sanction.
Due to the black and white nature of the penalty and finding of guilt, I suspect some cheating (etc.) is not reported.
I am not in favor of the single sanction.
Single sanction forces some strange accommodations for minimal offences. Frankly, I think this is ridiculous. The Honor Committee should either hold students' feet to the fire, or, more realistically and more reasonably, eliminate the single sanction and revise the all-or-nothing guilt verdict.
The strength and weakness of the system are that it depends on students' definition of seriousness. Students for the most part do not see dishonorable behavior like plagiarism of papers as serious enough to warrant imposition of the single sanction. Some forms of cheating are in effect permitted, while others are not. Blatant copying of work during exams or using cheat sheets in exams seems to be abhorred by students. I rarely encounter it. But use of paper files or other sources is fine. I suspect that some portion of students brought up on charges and expelled simply don't know or understand what the permissible forms of cheating are.
I would like to see a graduated system of penalties.
I do not fully leave the control of cheating to the students. I try to reduce the possibility of cheating as well as I can. For example: I have the students sit apart on tests. I have make up tests with different problems...
Takes too long.
Single sanction is too severe.
I like the fact that it keeps lying and cheating a matter of public discussion, but it still emits the faint whiff of the Southern "Code of Honor".
The single sanction policy is very destructive and unrealistic. The consequences of cheating are highly inconsistent as a result. The other major problem I have is with the wording of the honor pledge that is posted in classrooms. It focuses on not giving and receiving aid to/from classmates. This is unfortunate, since the main point of coming to a co-located university like UVA is to learn from one's classmates. I also find the tradition of writing such a pledge on assignments to be silly and negative - students should be trusted by default, it shouldn't be necessary to scribble a pledge on an assignment.
Single sanction is problematic. In terms of honor, underage drinking violates state law, and possessing and using a fake ID is fraud. Both of these are, by report, commonplace at UVA (and other colleges and universities). The Honor System is a charade.
Although students repeatedly endorse the single sanction approach, in rulings I've seen over the past six years that seems to deter the committee from punishing some students at all. The system also operates very slowly, so unless the student simply withdraws from the university (I've seen this 2-3 times), the actual event can be more than a year in the past before any action is taken.
I think the adversarial trial environment in which faculty character is impugned is too discouraging. Then, after dragging yourself through a most uncomfortable process the very likely outcome that the student is found not guilty is unsatisfying. There is more of a sense of control in assigning a zero to the assignment on which the student cheated.
Does it work?

Q: C2

My reservation is with the seriousness of the offense. If slightly less than serious offenses result in no punishment, then the system isn't going to work.
I don't feel cases are always treated fairly. It appears that due process is not always carried out.
Difficulty in getting faculty to actually prosecute and students to convict.
Single sanction is not always just.
Seems to have a class race bias in its implementation.
The Honor System is potentially troubling for students with an unclear concept of what constitutes cheating or plagiarism. In Virginia's version of Anglo-American culture, a culture that relies heavily on culturally specific notions of gentlemanly honor and culturally specific notions about the concept of plagiarism (Which, by the way, would have seemed peculiar in American culture of 1850. Newspapers reprinted articles from other newspapers, in full, without thinking of copyright, before the arrival of syndicates). These cultural codes can be learned, but it is unrealistic to expect someone from another culture (who is asked to perform challenging work, perhaps in a non-native language and who may be less familiar with UVa's culturally specific notions) to invest importance in them without allowing time to learn the codes. I have worked with Chinese students who found the focus on citation as peculiar. In their cultural norm, it was simply assumed that someone got their information from a reputable source, whether it was cited or not. The specific formats for citation, in which we invest great energy, are learned practices. We as teachers need to be especially sensitive to students. Sometimes they just don't know the difference between what can be presumed as common knowledge (need not be cited) and what must be cited.
I feel that there is a significant amount of teaching in larger, lower-level classes for non-majors.
The single sanction.
Not persuaded, it is fairly administered.
Until those involved restructure the system to reflect the absence of students as initiators or charges, faculty deserve much greater roles in the trial process.
I prefer to remove some of the temptation to cheat rather than totally trust students to not cheat.
There is a severe disconnect between the system as an institution and the students it purports to represent. The single sanction is a grotesque anachronism. The Honor System is seriously hampered in its efforts to change by a lack of historical perspective.
The single sanction causes juries to demand a level of proof (not only identical blue books but also physical evidence that students sat next to each other and were seen cheating) that is often not feasible. Open up the system to lesser sanctions or invest the resources (cameras, more thorough investigations) to make it easier to get a conviction.
Other actions should come under the jurisdiction of the Honor System. Lying to purchase alcohol or having a fake ID providing alcohol to those too young to legally drink, assault, sexual and other types hazing - these should all be subject to the Honor System and the single sanction.
Well, the recent open trial highlighted the problem that minor offenses go unpunished because jurors do not want to boot someone from here over a 'small' offense. Similarly, low student initiation rates demonstrate that many students hesitate to turn in a cheater for the same reason. At least some sort of modest penalty is also needed, in my opinion.
Lack confidence in bureaucracy handling cases.
Single sanction. I support the idea of a student-run Honor System, but not the application of a one-size-fits all penalty.
That students are not compelled to report offenses has made the faculty into the "Honor police". Without student participation in ALL aspects of the system, it does not operate as well as it should.
I think that the single sanction is the only reason that UVa has a reputation as a school with a useful Honor System. But it has become an excuse to not pursue certain violations. Things

like students using fake IDs or collaborating on individual take home assignments have become commonplace at UVa. Without taking measures to publicly support the single sanction and actually enforce it in all cases, the Honor System will continue to be underutilized.
I do not fully support the idea of single sanction. There are other more educational models that are almost as productive.
I believe single-sanction is still the rule and don't support that. I would like to see students more often shown the trust that should go with an Honor System. For instance, I think proctoring of exams is not consistent with an Honor System.
Challenge to the trust relationship between faculty and student. The (long) time it takes from violation to hearing too stressful for students.
Punishments are so harsh that I feel professors are reluctant to report seemingly small infractions, but then the punishments that the professors inflict are not harsh enough. It's as if the professors compensate.
I feel that the students have the liberty to cheat on small valued assignments without any repercussions but a zero grade. In general, these actions would not be considered serious enough to warrant expulsion.
I don't know enough about how it is working but think that the single sanction might be too severe in some cases.
I think that the single sanction is too restrictive. I would prefer a different penalty for smaller offenses (e.g. one year suspension or the like).
The trial system doesn't work. I suppose because of the single sanction but I'm not sure. Haven't thought / heard enough about it. I don't care enough.
The relationship between the faculty grading option and the Honor System is unclear. If students truly are responsible for their own honor and that of their peers, I should be able to turn a case over to the Honor System that doesn't meet the seriousness clause and that doesn't require implementing the sanction, and still expect the student to be tried and penalized. The Honor System should respect the position of faculty as experts in their field. My good friends who have gone through honor trials have been required to provide exact source texts in order to prove plagiarism. This should be unnecessary in cases where several faculty members look at a student's work and can make the argument that it could not possibly have been produced by one person (based on quality of writing, knowledge, etc.).
Single sanction and I don't think students always abide by it.
Level of punishment, and consequent reticence on the part of the jury to find students straightforwardly guilty, despite weighted evidence against them.
I think that there are a sizeable number of students who view the Honor System as a game, rather than as an ethical code. So, if they think they can get away with it, they do cheat. Given that dealing with the Honor Committee is such a time sink, most faculty deal with cheating themselves. I also think that the Honor Committee has done a really lousy job of orienting new faculty. When you have a spouse, children and a mortgage, you tend to think that the threat of permanent expulsion ought to be enough to keep students from taking that risk, but it isn't. Some students will cheat if they think you won't do anything. So you have no choice but to come on as a hard- {EXPLETIVE} to keep from having to deal with the Honor Committee.
Trials should be open to the public.
I am concerned about the incentives and disincentives created by the single sanction.
The reputation we enjoy nationally with our Honor System far exceeds the actual presence of an honor-abiding attitude among the students. There is a huge disconnect between an Honor System run by students, and the professors, who are the ones who should be enforcing the system. They are in a position to catch cheating far more often than the students. The students are also reluctant to report each other, and professors seem reluctant to report cases. I'm not sure why.
I had a friend who was convicted of an offense that was not even academically related. It

Q: C2

<p>was related to a job he got at the school (while as an undergraduate student). The mistake he did was so minor but he believes that the superior above him was overly passionate about it and took the matter to the extreme.</p>
<p>I think that the Honor System cannot succeed in the way that it should because it places too much responsibility on teaching faculty to police and catch dishonorable students. I think that students should be required on their honor as students to report any dishonorable activity that comes to their attention. Also, I think that it might be appropriate to suspend students for a year rather than dismiss them permanently, but I am not sure of this. Finally, I think that students should take all forms of cheating seriously, and not exonerate guilty students on the grounds of seriousness.</p>
<p>Does not always seem to be strict enough in practice.</p>
<p>The lack of faculty input, other than as a witness, once a case is reported is unfortunate, as is the single-sanction nature of the process.</p>
<p>It is clearly evident to our students that our national leaders gain their positions of power and influence through systematic lies in both campaigns and governing. Students can easily observe that corporations gain market advantage through behavior that may not be illegal, but clearly constitutes cheating. The University's Honor Code goes against a tide of observations in the lives of students today. It is difficult to illustrate the value benefits of honor when they watch TV and see one set of behaviors, and do not get to talk to a person for whom honor is vital in their professional lives: a scientist, physician or attorney for whom reputation is everything.</p>
<p>Reservations about how consistently the system is applied (for example, racial disparities in reporting) and concerns that the single sanction prevents folks from reporting cheating.</p>
<p>My impression is that it could be more strictly and uniformly enforced.</p>
<p>The single sanction system offers limited flexibility.</p>
<p>Honor is built not inherited. Many fine students who will be outstanding graduates of the University may make an error in judgment that they can recover from. A single sanction is unnecessary and counterproductive to our mission.</p>
<p>Individuals who do not relate to the concept of 'honor' might take advantage of the system.</p>
<p>Because of the severe consequences, I think that faculty are wary of address honor offenses, especially since the repercussions could be a drawn out civil court battle in the honor offender is dismissed from the University.</p>
<p>Single sanction for all offences.</p>
<p>We cannot expect the Honor System to work perfectly; therefore we must minimize the opportunities to cheat!</p>
<p>Concern that the single sanction may keep some from reporting violations of the Honor Code.</p>
<p>Single sanction.</p>
<p>Single sanction.</p>
<p>I have never understood the single-sanction system. I previously taught at a small college that had a three-level sanction: First offense: F on the assignment. Second offense: F in the course. Third offense: Expulsion. Because these penalties were reasonable, students and faculty were more willing to bring cases before the committee. There was also a counseling and support component - students who were caught cheating were usually in some sort of trouble, academic or personally, and the committee hearings (which were very supportive of everyone involved) provided a means to reach some troubled students who hadn't been properly identified by our counseling system. With the single-sanction, all such possibilities go out the window and the process becomes totally adversarial.</p>
<p>The system almost certainly is applied unevenly across the University.</p>
<p>The idea of codifying honor.</p>
<p>I have the impression that it is extremely difficult to obtain a conviction through the Honor System. In any case it is beyond my control.</p>

Not sure I agree with concept of single sanction.
There should be more student participation. The students should be obligated to report honor offenses that they have knowledge of. It should be a true student-run system with less faculty involvement.
While I understand the single sanction, I do have some reservations about it. I worry that adolescents biologically develop at different rates and judgment does not appear to be intact until the age of 25-27. Consequently, the single sanction seems harsh for adolescent judgment errors--though they are serious ones. On the other hand, the Honor System may not have the same impact if the single sanction did not exist. So, I have reservations.
The faculty I know seem not to be using the Honor System for tests or homework. I think it has lost support from many faculty.
I have had too many colleagues complain of students being exonerated in the face of compelling evidence of the student's guilt. On one or two occasions in the (now distant) past I have seen evidence of under-developed sense of due process on the part of students running the system.
There seems to be a lack of follow through in the Honor Code. Because expulsion is the only penalty, the Honor Code is weakly enforced at best. When I discuss the Honor Code in my classes, I'm aware that it is pretty much an empty threat that will keep honest people honest, but have no affect on those who intend to cheat. It also disturbs me that punishment for honor offenses are often carried out by the professor without reporting it. This leads to inconsistencies because there is no standardized rule. I am also disappointed that my students will look the other way when they observe a fellow classmate cheating.
Cumbersome process to adjudicate cases.
Fair administration.
I worry that students can rarely find another student guilty because of the single sanction.
Dismissal for a first offense is too harsh.
Single sanction does not allow students to learn from their mistakes. Can sometimes take an inordinate amount of faculty time when there is a hearing.
Process is too slow.
I believe it needs to be more a part of our culture and clearly stated to all students at the university. I think it is something students and faculty take for granted and do not use in any practical way.
Because I've seen so many people get off, I am reluctant to go through the whole ordeal (which is a lot of work for the faculty).
Not sure how well the peer judgment process works or how fair it is. Not sure how well faculty is protected by the University if litigations ensue as a result of having brought a student up on charges.
In most cases, I feel it is easier and fairer for the professor to assess guiltiness of a student and decide the punishment. A trial is too complicated and drawn out for minor infractions.
I'm not sure how the 'single sanction' works, i.e. whether there's any possibility for another chance for someone who cheats. However, I like the notion of the Honor System in general and I think it's effective.
I would like to see a system where, if a student gets caught, their transcript is marked and their future professors alerted that someone registered for their class has a breach. If they make it to graduation without re-offending, the mark on the transcript should disappear. Seems a harsh enough penalty -- no prospect of study abroad, scholarships, etc., until they clear their name.
The single sanction issue is problematic. The world is not black and white, neither is student behavior.
There might be situations with mitigating circumstances in which some punitive action is warranted but expulsion is not. Otherwise, I find the Honor Code to be useful and worthwhile.
Seriousness clause. Single sanction. Lack of participation by students that have observed

cheating.
I support it because it makes my life easier as a faculty member, but I'm not naive enough to think that it prevents students from cheating. I believe that only a fraction of observed infractions get reported and pursued.
The aforementioned disparity between announced and actual standards for bringing cases to trial. The single sanction -- a really bad idea.
I am concerned that there does not appear to be clear standards for determination of guilt; nor does there seem to be uniform imposition of the penalty when guilt is determined.
Penalty.
The need to deal with problems through student committees. If I catch a student cheating on homework, I would choose to give a failing grade on that assignment. Cheating on exams or papers is serious enough to warrant an honor violation.
Single sanction - bad on a number of levels.
Single sanction punishments should be reserved for the most egregious transgressions (i.e. blatant plagiarism, using papers purchased online, etc.). Faculty need to have some leeway in determining what corrective actions need to be taken. Faculty need increased support to research plagiarism. I'm too overworked as it is. I don't have the time to spend searching for pilfered passages.
Single sanction. Large burden for faculty initiating action.
I think the single sanction undermines the system by preventing students and professors from turning in cases. I also think it makes juries less likely to convict a student, and that seems bad to me.
I think single-sanction should be re-examined because almost all honor investigations are begun by faculty and not students. I think if a jury could turn in another verdict based on the seriousness of the offense, more investigations would be started.
From what I heard, once a cheating is found, the punishment is very serious. So many faculty members even if they found a cheating student, they will try to avoid reporting the student to the university. Instead, they talk to the students, like an oral warning. I think an Honor System should work in a way that depending on how serious the problem, the punishment should be different.
There should be less drastic sanctions than dismissal. In my case, I observed plagiarism on a paper. Some students are actually somewhat confused about the line between appropriate use of materials written by others and plagiarism. While I believe this student should have known that the actions the student undertook were wrong, it was not as clear-cut a situation as copying from a neighbor during an exam. The single sanction does not allow for a range of punishments to fit the varying severity of infractions.
I feel that the single sanction, while effective and deserved in cases, can be harsh and that other avenues of punishment might be explored. I also don't feel that all of the students buy into the Honor System from anecdotes I have heard. But my own personal experience has never led me to distrust it.
One offense and then dismissal without recourse.
I don't know how effective it is. It seems to me like a lot of instructors deal with cases of cheating on their own. In a recently publicized case, I'm sure the TA and professor went through lots of work to report the case but then the students' actions were determined to be not serious. So for things like cheating on homework assignments, maybe it is more efficient time-wise for us to just get the student to admit it and force him or her to re-do the assignment. Otherwise, I think the Honor System is a good idea. I am proud to be at a University that has such a thing.
It should also apply to faculty. I know of the spouse of a prominent physician who is hired full time but only works sporadically.
Need for refining the offenses and the associated penalties
I am concerned that it actually makes it easier for students to cheat because no one will really accuse them of cheating without very strong reasons. I'm also a bit concerned that



Q: C2

students don't understand it, and are afraid to ask one another for help on assignments or studying because they are afraid to violate the Honor Code. In my experience, this kind of paranoia puts undue burdens on TA's, because students only ask their TA questions that they could easily ask a fellow student.
Single sanction. I wish there was a penalty of semester or yearlong suspension as an option.
Seems lengthy and adversarial to faculty.
The single sanction is a barrier to the reporting of known honor offenses. The Honor Committee and its adherents seem unable to make necessary changes in it to improve the system.
I suspect there are gross inconsistencies in treatment because of the relative lack of continuity of procedures and participants.
The single sanction leads to extreme and horizontally inequitable punishments. Students do not take an active role in the Honor System leaving it to faculty. Perhaps because of the single sanction, student juries are much too lenient; leaving faculty with the impression that going through the hard work of pursuing a case is pointless.
I am concerned that students will not report other student whom they observe cheating, so the policing system may not be as powerful as we would like.
That we take sufficient steps to reduce the temptation for honor violations.
Allows the students to feel that assignments and exams can be arranged to suit their schedules, since the Honor Code allows for multiple exam seating, etc.
It in many ways relieves the faculty member from responsibility to monitor for cheating. Also, after my one incident observing a student cheating, I felt I had no recourse without 100% evidence.
I don't like the single sanction. (I wouldn't want a slap on the hand either, which I've seen at some universities.)
It would be more effective if less cumbersome, and a clearer definition of "reprehensible" might be useful.
My reservations are that during the 25 years I've been here I've been involved in so many of these surveys.
I've referred cases to the Honor System before but it's difficult to convict someone without conclusive evidence and conclusive evidence is hard to come by.
Students appear reluctant to report others on some occasions. There appear to be too many loopholes that allow obviously guilty parties to be acquitted.
Not being familiar enough with it as a newer faculty member.
I have not experienced but have heard of and am concerned about alleged racial bias in the system. Also, I have some doubt about the maturity level of the students ruining the system.
I think the single sanction is inappropriate.
As stated above, I do not believe that students always understand the seriousness of an offense. I also believe the system was developed under very different cultural and historical circumstances from those that obtain here today. And I am not certain if we should preserve the single sanction.
Overzealous professors could ruin the academic life of a student who unknowingly committed an offense.
I think the process should be made clearer to all. I think that a single sanction is too severe. Strike one = severe warning and course failure. Strike two = the student is permanently dismissed. Cases in which students turn themselves around for the better should be honored. Also, what about those cases (even if very rare) in which students are permanently dismissed but they are in fact innocent? This is why I'd have a "two strikes and you're out" system.
Single sanction. Uneven actions based on intent and seriousness.
My reservations are related to what I would call an all or nothing principle.

Cumbersome nature of trials, unreliable interpretation of seriousness.
The support of students in enforcing with peers; international students - cultural differences
The system is dependent on the integrity of each individual, but I think the system as a whole is the best we can do.
I suppose that the single standard must be somewhat inadequate to cover all cases. And yet I might not be averse to extending it to cases in which the student is involved in and convicted of a true felony in criminal court.
How many times do you want to hear this? THE SINGLE SANCTION!
Need for sanctions less than expulsion.
The dismissal sanction. I think there ought to be a faculty sanction - course failure. A student sanction, which is the same. A student sanction for repeat offences - which is dismissal.
The definitions of what constitutes an honor offense can sometimes be ambiguous.
Single sanction is too strong a punishment for certain infractions.
I don't think an Honor System works when the students rarely report one another.
The single sanction. In addition, the lack of student commitment to filing offenses.
Process is much too time consuming for faculty who suspect cheating has occurred.
Has become too easy for students to evade single sanction.
The single sanction. I would like to see certain offences result only in failing a class, especially if it is a question about only one assignment, and especially if it is not egregious.
I know most cheating can't be proven to the degree required to obtain a conviction. I know a small number of students have absolutely no hesitation about devising ways of getting around the system.
Enforcement has become arbitrary and distorted a system in which students generally behave well.
Perhaps the single sanction is too strict.
Severity and clarity, and relevance for an internet age -- how to respond or address increased possibility for certain forms of plagiarism.
Equal treatment for all groups of students, not just members of particular groups.
Single sanction is too severe for all offenses.
Single sanction based on "gentlemen's" culture.
Single sanction.
Single sanction does not always seem appropriate.
The single sanction. Also the reluctance of most students to report on each other, and the difficulty of undergraduates handling serious legal proceedings.
Students realize that only large infractions are likely to result in their expulsion, so they perceive that they can get away with smaller offenses.
The feedback I have heard from other graduate students and faculty, which suggests that the process is unnecessarily time-consuming for the reporting TA or professor. Unfortunately, I do not have the luxury of extra time to spend reporting a case and, more importantly, following through with it during the lengthy trial procedure.
I strongly oppose the single sanction. It causes a serious problem of underreporting because students fear getting a classmate thrown out of school.
Don't have a good feel for if single sanction makes things better or worse in terms of number of cases submitted. Being involved with an honor case is extremely time consuming for faculty, I am afraid this may leave some to not report incidents.
I'm not sure whether the pledge system really works with students. We want to believe that it does, but how do we really know?
There are some cases where it is not clear how a professor stands on certain assignments. The Honor Code seems rather unforgiving in cases where ambiguity may exist. It is very important though and seems to be fairly universally enforced, which is great.

Q: C2

Single sanction is inappropriate in some cases.
The single sanction rule, as I understand it, is not realistic. The pressure to maintain high grades gets worse every year and students are just human beings.
I'm not a fan of the single sanction. The principles under which the Honor System operates are known, but the process is not.
Single sanction limits referrals. Students' repeatedly vote for single sanction for this reason.
Single sanction seems to be too strong.
Student jury, which sometimes may not make the best decision.
I believe that Single Sanction is rarely warranted, and that failing a student on an assignment / in a course is often sufficient punishment. It is, after all, our duty to teach students, and how can they learn from the mistake of violating the Honor Code if they are automatically dismissed?
That it simply seems too idealistic for such a large school.
Lack of flexibility in the consequences ability to suit the offence.
I don't believe that expulsion is the best way to punish students who violate the Honor Code. I think that other options should also be available. At my undergrad university, punishment ranged from failing the assignment, failing a course, and on up. With these different options, students were much more inclined to reveal that the Honor Code had been violated.
The time involved in pursuing a case presents a deterrent. Additionally, there is the perception that perhaps because of the single sanction, it is unduly difficult to get a jury of undergraduates to convict one of their peers.
I'm not sure that I understand the single sanction is and whether or not I agree with it. We hear the term a lot, without it ever really being explained.
The single sanction makes it difficult to implement fairly. Because of it there is a high burden of proof of guilt, which reduces the motivation of faculty to pursue cases.
I do not think that the single sanction is effective. Students make mistakes. I think that it should be taken on a case-by-case basis.
Cheating is very offensive to me, and it does not have a place at any University. Honor Systems are great; however, they usually aren't enforced enough, or are enforced too much. I like the Honor System the way it is, and I believe honor offenses should be punished strictly. But being in a TA position and hopefully a future faculty position, I would feel reservations about reporting that student and getting them kicked out. Maybe if they were fined and put on some kind of probation - a clear warning if you will - on the first offense, and then get booted the second offense, I would feel less remorse about reporting the student the first or the second time. I believe in second chances, but not a third or fourth or fifth. I have seen what too lightly enforced Honor Systems can do, that doesn't work well. I will admit though, getting kicked out on the first offense makes me ask my self. What if this was the first and only time this student has ever cheated in his / her life? I believe in second chances.
I think the permanent dismissal policy is a little harsh, the circumstances around the case should be considered.
Mostly a lack of understanding. It seems that there are many potential honor violations, but only major violations seem to be addressed, and those often do not seem to end in suspension or dismissal, which I thought were the only possible outcomes of a trial.
That students do not understand how the system works, that the processes are continually changing, and, that the system is seen as adversarial.
I don't know that it really works.
Stupid to include public drunkenness. If that's a violation, go ahead and expel practically every underclassman and many graduate students as well. Including something like this as a violation ensures that many students will see the System as a total joke! No student is going to report another for such a thing! Get rid of it. I think that drug related issues are similarly gratuitous. Stick to the important issues here - issues involving work the students do at the university (tests, papers, etc). Having said this, why would you include public

Q: C2

drunkenness and not sexual harassment? Having a single sanction prevents many instances from being turned in - like cheating on a quiz, for instance.
Single sanction - very severe punishment. The seriousness clause seems to leave a lot of room for interpretation.
I think that there should be different types of punishments for different types of violations. I think that prior accusations should be admissible (I know this is double-jeopardy, but I know faculty who have reported the same student on multiple occasions and that student has never received the single sanction). I also believe that rape and sexual assault are offenses that demand the single sanction and these offenses largely go unpunished. In what world does it make sense that a student who copies a worksheet for a language class can be expelled, but a rapist is allowed to stay on grounds preying on each class of women?
Unsure ness about efficacy of trial procedure, and the one strike you're out policy. It hasn't been made clear to me how the severity of the offense comes into play in the trial, or how it is to be decided if an offense warrants expulsion.
Single sanction is too harsh a penalty for a single cheating. I wish there were more ways to offer penalty depending one the seriousness of the case.
That the University Administration does not support faculty during the process.
Disagree with single-sanction. Concerned that current system does not distinguish between degrees of severity in violations.
I think the idea is good, but the implementation doesn't work. Students aren't willing to vote to kick a student out and TAs find the process far too difficult to pursue.
I think that there should be multiple sanctions.
I don't have specific reservations to the Honor System. The language of strongly supports was a little too much for me given my prior experience when I suspected a student was cheating but didn't have strong enough evidence to turn the student in.
It is hard to make a decision on whether the student has cheated.
The current sanction is appropriate for certain levels of cheating, but generally not appropriate as worded.
I feel that undergraduate students are under a lot of grade pressure and when placed in a situation where it is easy to cheat, they may be more likely to do it, out of fear of failure. If it was a more involved process to cheat it may make them pause, consider what they are doing more and rethink their actions. I feel like the Honor Code is important but for example closed book, take-home exams, are too tempting. There becomes the feeling that everyone else is doing it so I may as well double check in my notes. At my previous University, during final exams we were able to schedule our own exams due to the Honor Code but we took the exams in proctored rooms.
The single sanction does not seem to allow for the degree of the offense.
I believe it is very difficult to prove a student is cheating the process is very stressful and painful for the instructor.
It receives too much publicity. True, Virginia takes pride in a legitimate trust-based social code of ethics, but what credited universities do not? I doubt many universities tolerate cheating and stealing.
Single sanctions are most effective as a deterrent, but, deterrence requires more than the threat of punishment, it need sufficient likelihood of getting caught. Because the students don't believe in the system, they do not report violations and the threat of getting caught is low. Then, when somebody does get caught, the punishment seems unfair (thus perpetuating the student's perceptions).
Dismissal for a first offense strikes me as pretty harsh, and my guess is that it raises the bar in prosecution cases. This is why I take pains to explain plagiarism and cheating on my syllabus each term. I hope to avoid putting any student in risk of falling into a situation where her or his actions would fall into a murky or uncertain area as to the Honor Code.
I don't think it is ever a wise idea to give an unproctored exam.
The inordinate number of athletes and students of color who are brought up on charges and /

Q: C2

or found guilty. There are structural factors at the university (and in society at large) that make this kind of over reporting prevalent.
I think that it is more geared towards a law / history / English course of study than it is a mathematical / engineering / science course of study. I also think that it relies heavily upon student support and I'm not entirely sure that the system doesn't make it easier for students to slip one through the cracks because of it.
Completely dismissing a student versus giving them a second chance. Some students may not even realize their actions result in cheating
Not sure about the whole single sanction thing.
Single sanction.
The single sanction that results in dismissal from the University for any guilty verdict rendered seems rather harsh, and it seems to be a deterrent to juries rendering such verdicts even if they are convinced that the party on trial is guilty.
My perception (from peers and reading the student paper) is that student juries are often unwilling to find cheaters guilty because of the single sanction rule. I also am concerned that (according to reports) foreign students are being reported for cheating at such a discrepantly high rate. I think teachers need more training on understanding how to help teach these students about the Honor System.
Sometimes we also need discretion though seemingly there is a violation.
The single sanction!
I wish we TA's were more clear on what the penalties are and how they are assigned. It takes a lot of time and effort for a TA to come forward with an offense and it's disappointing to spend time and energy on a case that is ultimately fruitless.
The single sanction is not appropriate for all instances. This leads faculty members to handle many of these problems without resorting to the Honor System. Because of this, the justice is uneven, and certain students are expelled for offenses that other students are barely punished for.
One-penalty makes it less likely incidents are reported.
In some cases the punishment for violating the Honor System is too severe.
The need for more enforcement.
Poor or inconsistent enforcement; single sanction may be too severe for some offenses.
There exists major and minor offenses. For major offenses (blatant cheating or plagiarism, stealing, illegal activities, etc) I believe harsh punishment / expulsion is appropriate. However, for minor offenses like I've encountered, I truly believe students were unaware of the many gray areas that can be considered plagiarism. Some leniency in these situations is necessary (one warning). As a teaching institution, we have a responsibility to teach students what is right and acceptable and what is not.
I believe that the students in the 'court' do not get enough training or guidance on the expectations and limitations of the process. Even those who are supposed to advise faculty end up asking faculty what to do, rather than telling the faculty what they need to know. I do appreciate that the Code is an excellent opportunity for students to take responsibility for their own behaviors, but there needs to be some overall procedural continuity provided to the process so that faculty time and energy is not wasted and their willingness to participate in the process eroded.
I think that a single sanction system is too severe and discourages reporting of incidents of cheating.
It shouldn't be single sanction.
Single sanction may be too harsh in a number of cases due to mitigating circumstances.
I think that often times there is more to the story and that there can be mitigating circumstances.
Faculty need to be more comfortable in reporting instances of cheating in the classroom. The proceedings should not seem so daunting as to deter people from reporting Honor Code

offenses.
Single sanction and difficulty of sound judgment on the part of students.
I feel that sometimes students unintentionally don't footnote something in their paper, for example, not because they are trying to plagiarize, but that they don't fully know or understand the process of a research paper. Or sometimes there are second language issues or a student may not have enough experience going to a school in the United States. I don't know if or how the Honor System takes into account such cases. The university, as far as I can tell does not seem to have a good infrastructure for international students or for students with varied backgrounds. These students need some initial help to catch up and understand the system, before they can be judged by the Honor System.
I think the Honor System would be more effective if there were a menu of sanctions that could be chosen from to apply to guilty cases. I think that would lead to more cases being investigated and more convictions where they are due.
I think that the Honor Code is nice, but I do think that some students will take opportunities to cheat if they are blatantly obvious, easy, and basically not punishable because the cheating cannot be proven. Allowing students to take not proctored I.D. literature exams, whether they do or do not pledge the Honor Code, seems, to me, to be asking for trouble. It is just too easy to cheat.
Too strict.
Single sanction seems to preclude the idea that students can learn from one mistake. Also puts an undue burden on TAs since I've heard of students hiring lawyers, etc. - who would want to subject themselves to that? It also seems that few cheating cases actually get reported or punished b/c the punishment is so harsh - seems a disincentive to reporting cheating.
My main reservations are: Are systematic human biases playing a role in our judgments that lead to who is tried and found guilty (much like law courts)? Different types of cheating in my opinion should warrant different punishments, so while the standardization of punishment is a great thing, I'm concerned about the all or none nature of punishment.
The difficulties associated with the trial proceedings and the low likelihood that there would be a guilty verdict.
I am concerned over the students overseeing the other students in the council... I think it places them in an awkward position for having to penalize a classmate.
I acknowledge the inevitable failures of the system.
My main reservation with regard to the Honor Code is that some students may not take it seriously and take advantage of situations of trust (take-home exams, unproctored exams, etc.) and cheat.
Consistency - Politics, jury inexperience and popularity can shade the outcome. The process is too adversarial towards faculty and is biased too heavily in favor of the student. As an addendum, the faculty member involved is often lambasted by administration and students for various reasons.
I don't want a student to be dismissed permanently from the university.
I wish there were another option for punishment, instead of the all or nothing, because it would encourage more convictions.
I am concerned that honorable students might be at a disadvantage when students are trusted too much and have too much freedom.
Making students pledge each assignment seems silly and somewhat in opposition to the environment of trust that the system is supposed to support.
Permanent dismissal must be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
I don't like the single sanction system. I would favor a separate Honor System run by and for students in my school (Law School).
I've heard that the single penalty was not recently enforced and I am not sure if I believe in the single penalty anyway.
Inflexibility of penalty structure.

I'm not confident that students are always able to make the subtle decisions necessary in prosecuting cases. I'm also concerned about who gets reported and the potential for abuse.
The reservations are that the instructors need to carry unnecessary burdens to prove student's cheat in their academic activities.
It does not deter cheating nor provide appropriate justice for all involved.
The single sanction is a serious impediment to faculty and students bringing cases. The system is very complex and legalistic, with too many rules and procedures - students try to minimize the burden on faculty who initiate cases, but it still turns out to be very time consuming for faculty, and I fear many faculty just won't initiate cases.
Single sanction discourages students and faculty from filing charges.
Not all professors agree with the system in the first place, and secondly, there are too many possibilities for unequal treatment of students. Some will be reported, and others not at all.
I, along with many of my colleagues, suspect that jurors in honors cases sometimes acquit students they know to be guilty because they don't want to feel responsible for getting someone expelled.
From what I have heard, the amount of time and stress needed to bring a charge against a student is considerable. This may discourage time-pressed instructors from bringing charges.
Single sanction is too onerous. A more nuanced set of punishments for honor offenses would make more sense. Also, the Honor System was originally intended to function with students disciplining fellow students when behavior went against the community's code. However, now, students seem to prize loyalty to one another, even when a fellow student has committed a clear, even flagrant honor offense, over taking initiative to report a violation. One result is that faculty become the enforcers, while students avert their eyes when peers cheat on a test or pass a fake ID. The disconnect between the talk about Honor and students' actions these days is sometimes difficult to see. It would be refreshing if students were to reclaim real, substantive responsibility for the Honor System and for identifying and disciplining those of their peers who violate the Honor Code. Perhaps students could bear this responsibility more easily if there weren't but one sanction.
Single punishment for cheating.
Just the single sanction aspect of it. At Rice, my alma matter, we also had an Honor Code. We had to take an exam on the Honor Code before we could enroll in classes and we had to pass the exam. We didn't have a single sanction policy. It was clear you'd be very screwed if you broke the Honor Code, and I know professors weren't as cautious when reporting incidents because the end result wasn't always going to be expulsion - unless it was truly warranted.
Single sanction - punishment rather than remediation.
The single sanction impedes enforcement. Faculty have no input other than as accusers.
Single sanction for mostly minor offenses doesn't make sense. I can imagine a lot of wasted time.
It works well in the medical school. It needs to be fixed in the undergraduate school.
Student's unwillingness to initiate honor offenses or to judge behavior as serious.
If I understand correctly, the one strike rule seems pretty unforgiving. That's also probably why it's so effective. I've also heard that instructors who actually follow up on honor violations often find themselves embroiled in prolonged processes that have some potential to be damaging to their career and / or reputation.
The single sanction for every case seems pretty harsh. If the punishments varied according to the fault, I think people would be more willing to report violations and enforce them.
As with many faculty, the single sanction. I don't mean to sound condescending, but younger people tend to be more idealistic than older people. This is strength - it leads them to challenge the complacency of their elders - but also a weakness in the case of the Honor System.
It doesn't apply to certain egregious moral indiscretions, such as criminal activity like rape.

Q: C2

Does not appear to be applied consistently.
Dishonorable jury conducts, possibly stemming from single sanction.
Does it really work?
Concerns about how effective it is - especially with regard to trials of students suspected of violations.
The single sanction does not allow any chance to counsel students and help them improve their behavior. It also sets a bar that is so high it may discourage faculty from reporting a suspected offense. Conversely, the ability of the student to retract something before an offense has been reported is also inimical to a real Honor System.
I don't think it's realistic to expect one student to report on another student and I'm not sure that the single sanction is the best response.
The system would only punish those who were caught or who their professors took the trouble to report. Therefore the impression to me and to the students is that only those unlucky ones will be punished.
Needs greater attention to issues of diversity / student behavior towards others.
The single sanction issue is of some concern related to cheating, plagiarizing, etc. The violation would have to be very extreme. I don't condone cheating but I would hesitate to use the Honor System because of the single sanction.
Penalty of dismissal is too harsh, which is why the cases are rare.
I like the concept - but it does not work. The culture of much of the student body is out of synch with notions embedded in the Honor Code. Students will not report each other - and there is widespread cheating - about which they don't seem to care. As a result - the code is effectively toothless. So while I support the concept - it is simply not working.
Single sanction is so severe it may inhibit reporting of offenses an observer thinks is minor.
Single sanction makes it difficult to bring cases of suspected cheating.
I don't think students will turn each other in. If professors catch them, then fine, but otherwise, they aren't responsible for policing themselves.
Single sanctions.
Students still cheat and surveys show that majority do not turn in someone if they observe it. The famous {NAME} incident just showed his system has no honor as well as that all students were presumed guilty.
Single sanction.
I am concerned about the council that enforces the Honor Code, and I think that permanent expulsion from the University is so severe that the Honor Code is not always enforced.
I worry about the single sanction, and I worry that having students in charge makes the entire process a questionable way of finding out who is truly guilty.
Based on what I have heard and not through direct experiences, there have been instances where the Honor Committee has not taken circumstances into consideration.
Degree of lying, cheating, stealing tolerated....there seems to be a threshold of tolerance which I am not clear about yet. Grievances need to be blatant and without a reasonable doubt...strong proof required. Students do not seem to report students that cheat. It seems to fall to faculty which it should not under the systems design. In my cases I am sure that other students are aware of those that cheat.
The students involved seem disinclined to kick anyone out of the University. A frequent loophole is the seriousness clause.
There is more cheating that goes on than is acknowledged. We trust but do not verify the veracity of participants.
Some offenders are never punished, while those that are guilty have their educational careers terminated.
I oppose the single sanction and find it unfair in principle and practice. The Honor Committee does not do a good job at recruiting minority and underrepresented student to its ranks; 'politicos', are overrepresented. Spotlighting of minority students remains a real problem.



Faculty are treated as adversaries in the process. There is too little continuity in quality from year to year. For example, an excellent Chair can frequently be succeeded by a poor one.
I think multiple sanctions would be more effective than the single sanction. I think people would report more cheating incidents if the sanction were less severe. It seems extreme to me for some types of academic misconduct that could be defined as cheating. The single sanction is really my only issue with the current system.
I fear the investigations do not have sufficient rules for evidence.
Students do not report violations, so it isn't really their system for most students. Most students don't consider 'little things' like copying another student's problem set really cheating. Single sanction so strong to minimize use of system. Students seem to enjoy benefits of system but most don't take responsibilities very seriously.
It is not very effective in preventing cheating.
It's still too hard to prove a student cheated. If the Honor System could address this problem, it would be much more effective.
Penalties strike me as too hard.
Concern that single sanction limits willingness to punish cheating.
The single sanction leaves no room for the context of the event or the magnitude of the offense.
I think the single sanction is problematic, in that a professor or TA may observe something that they do not believe warrants expulsion from the University, so they don't report it. Also, there are certain cultural aspects of it - such as the tradition of allowing students to take final exams anywhere on grounds - that are problematic.
I am convinced that there should be more than a single sanction. I think that would strengthen (not weaken) the Honor System.
If I had a case of clear cheating, I would immediately report it. However, luckily, this has not happened to me, and I would not report something purely based on my impression / suspicion.
Single sanction is way too strong on some cases and the process a big hassle which leads people to avoid dealing with it when possible.
I don't understand how the UVa system is any different from Honor Codes at other universities, except that the single sanction makes it flashier.
This is based on incomplete info (I know that I don't know the ins and outs), but my impression is that a first offense can result in expulsion. I think this makes it harder for some people to turn others in, or harder to self-report. Second, my impression is that the students think it's a lip-service thing and not something to be taken seriously, like an abstinence-only sex-ed curriculum. I don't see how the current system offers the possibility of combating that attitude. To close: this all comes with the caveat that beyond my initial orientation session on it, I have no further training/insight on the system. These are impressions.
That the verdicts are often not guilty when they should have been guilty, and that this may be caused by the jury knowing how serious the penalty is and being afraid of ruining a student's education.
After reading in the newspaper about Honor Committee trials, I am not convinced that the trials were strict enough with violators.
Most of my reservations are with the dismal of a student if found guilty after one conviction. Another reservation I have is regarding racism. The University, overall, is struggling with issues of racism, which I think the Honor System is plagued with as well. I'm not sure, though, if the Honor System has been open to in-depth analysis and possible structural changes in the system to correct these issues.
I do not support the single sanction.
The concept is wonderful in principle. However; and perhaps this just reflects my own distrust of human nature, I am not certain that everyone has the capacity to resist temptation. I'm also not 100% certain that a student suspected of cheating would actually be brought before the Honor Committee. It's a serious charge, and I think the tendency may be for

Q: C2

students (and professors) who suspect another student to let small instances slide, or to deal with them independently of the Honor System, rather than to bring official charges.
Penalties seem too harsh for some offenses and not tough enough for others.
I have some problem with the one strike policy. I think we should seriously consider giving students a warning before dropping them from the university. Everybody makes mistakes.
The length of the process and the loopholes that could hinder justice.
Single sanction and seriousness stipulation.
I don't like the single sanction and am very uncertain about how students understand and adhere to the system. That is, it's not clear to me what students think about it. It seems to me that there are different views on different kinds of behavior. Some seem more serious than others but the system doesn't take this into account.
Sometimes I wonder to what extent pledging is respected by the student, and to what extent it is the honest truth.
One sanction - don't like.
Students don't take the Honor Code as seriously as I do.
I would prefer that there were degrees of punishment, if only two, for the manner of the offense. The severity of the punishment discourages me from employing the Honor Committee even if I feel the student has committed an offense.
The single sanction.
That which defines an act appears to be somewhat vague and this leaves room for one to be falsely accused based on a misunderstanding of what truly defines an act of dishonesty. It also seems there should be an intermediate scale of punishment in order to punish those that commit an act that is not defined as serious, because it falls that the mere accusation affects the trustworthiness of the accused and the question of whether the accused is so untrustworthy that it merits dismissal from the university seems arbitrary.
The procedure is too time consuming and without consequence for most professors to bother with it. There is little or no legal protection for a professor who brings charges--once a colleague of mine was sued, and, though I don't know if anything came of it, I also don't know if he got much in the way of University assistance. I went to a school, which had an Honor System with two sanctions, and it worked well, I thought. It was easier to convict a new student and the penalty was a one-term suspension.
The time it takes for cases to be tried is in many cases fundamentally unfair. Clearer guidelines of what constitutes an honor offense in particular circumstances (or what does not constitute a valid excuse) would be helpful for students. More detailed information for faculty and students on how to proceed once a case has been initiated (i.e., all parties should write down their impressions immediately, write a chronology of events, seating chart, faculty should keep copies of exams or ask for them back from students) would make the process fairer to both parties..
My main problem seems to be the investigation and trial system. Students are reluctant to find guilty verdicts because of the single sanction. Athletes seem to have an advantage in the process. The trial system seems more like a forum than a pursuit of truth.
Single sanction. That the code does not go far enough - would like to clear acts of discrimination be considered an honor violation.
I think there's a tendency to hide our heads in the sand because the negative consequences of finding a student cheating are so high. I worry that it unfairly helps those people who are not afraid to cheat, and keeps grades down for the honest students.
Single-sanction is extreme - not that I have any better ideas. The harsh punishment prevents many people from reporting Honor Code violations.
It's too time-consuming and most undergrads are not willing to expel a fellow student. Graduate and professional students are much more willing.
I don't believe it is realistic to transform students from all walks of life as soon as they become a student at UVA. Lying and cheating is relatively commonplace in our society and many enter UVA with a pattern from their past. I believe the single sanction is too strict --

<p>may deter faculty from reporting and this may in fact be influenced by a reluctance by the Honor Committee to convict a student when the evidence would suggest that they were guilty. A one warning and then you are out policy might alleviate both of these issues -- then the second infraction (after a student has been warned) becomes more significant in terms of the likelihood that a student really has a pattern of violations.</p>
<p>The Honor Systems has loopholes in the sense that those who cheat in an intelligent way are not always caught.</p>
<p>I think that students are uncomfortable with turning in a peer because they know the ramifications of a peer cheating. However, as a teacher, I think that students shouldn't be tempted either. This is why I always remain in the room when students take a test. I don't want them to be in a position to make a poor choice. They may feel helpless, for whatever reason and so I don't want them to make a poor choice.</p>
<p>I have some reservations about the single sanction. If this is an institution of learning, shouldn't students be given the opportunity to learn from their mistakes at the University? Suspension for a year would reinforce the notion that cheating has grave consequences and yet allow the student to return to the University if they so choose to rebuild their academic life.</p>
<p>Needs to be simplified.</p>
<p>Single sanction makes it too hard to convict a student.</p>
<p>I am concerned about the burden it places upon students who serve on the juries.</p>
<p>Single sanction concern.</p>
<p>My experience with an honor case was that it was very time consuming and emotionally draining. I had to repeat the story to multiple sets of honor investigators. My reservation is that there is too much turnover or a lack of continuity, especially when the cheating occurs in a final exam.</p>
<p>Single sanction. Context needs to be considered.</p>
<p>I think some students can use outside influences (i.e. alumni who donate lots of money) to influence the process. I also have reservations about the work and pressure it can put on faculty members who report students. I know faculty who know students cheat but don't take it forward but encourage other faculty to do so.</p>
<p>I think there should be something other than the single sanction punishment for honor violations.</p>
<p>Not sure it actually works - have heard rumors that it is a huge time sink to report a case, and that the students don't end up being convicted anyway (even, in some past cases) for gross violations.</p>
<p>Single sanction too draconian, and results in more toleration of cheating than would otherwise be the case, I believe - not only in terms of reluctance to report, but also in terms of reluctance to convict.</p>
<p>As I mentioned in my earlier comment. It seems the students often get off. The definitions of what's not okay seem self-serving sometimes. The faculty never knows what happened even if they referred It feels a little like Big Brother and 18th Century furtiveness at times.</p>
<p>The single sanction. It seems that some lying is tolerated, e.g., re alcohol offenses and getting into events using fake ID. - but maybe I don't have correct facts about these examples.</p>
<p>Students should be well informed about the Honor System. The negative perception associated with it should be removed, before the Honor System is imposed on them. The students should be well aware of the consequences if found guilty for an honor violation.</p>
<p>I would like for the Honor System to have a sanction that allows a student to learn from the student's mistakes and not have to be dismissed. For instance, a conscious retraction process is somewhat like a dual sanction.</p>
<p>I was not impressed with the jury of a particular honor's trial I observed, most of the students were first year and I think unfamiliar with the system. The student was found guilty in spite there being reasonable doubt and that it came down to the word of an undergraduate student</p>

Q: C2

grader who was grading a very large class and the word of the accused student. Personally I felt that it was a miscarriage of justice to expel someone from the University with such sparse and subjective evidence.
I think the reporting system needs revamping, people may be reluctant to get involved in the process because they fear that it will be a long drawn out business.
I think we make it too easy for students to cheat...have an Honor Code along with in-class, proctored exams
I wonder if it treats all students fairly.
The single sanction system makes it a difficult choice for faculty. Regardless of the level of the infraction, you have to be willing to have a student expelled to take it up with the system. This leaves no room to consider shades of gray in situations. I have also heard horror stories of faculty being sued by students' families regarding honor offenses. I would like to see a system with less rigid punishment systems. In addition, I am very concerned about the discrepancy between the treatment of academic infractions and behavioral and character incidents. The Honor System should encompass all dimensions of being a student - including behavior and treatment of other students. Hate crimes and sexual assault are not considered infractions under the Honor System and I find that incredulous. I believe that we need a broader conception of the meaning of honor. Academics are important; they are not the sole defining characteristic of honorable human behavior.
The single sanction can be a strong punishment for 'minor' violations. That the only thing worse than an Honor Code violation is accusing someone of an Honor Code violation. It takes an insurmountable quantity of evidence to be certain of accusing someone of a violation.
My students are graduate students who are taking classes in addition to their full time jobs. I use the Honor System in my class; the major area of concern for me is plagiarism on written work. I think most of problematic/controversial areas of the Honor System pertain to undergraduate students and student culture.
Single penalty probably discourages reporting.
I suspect it is selectively enforced even in those cases where students are reported. Are only undergraduates on the committee? The surrounding bureaucracy is no encouragement to report. There seems little by way of academic support services for anyone except athletes and first year writing students. Why do so many of my students have no idea how awful their study habits and time-management skills are? Is the question of academics broached at orientation? When students have trials it is reported in the most sensational fashion in the Cavalier Daily (this comment is a criticism). Too many things which actually violate a community of trust - e.g. sexual assault, racism, and homophobia - are neglected by the Honor Code in what I understand of its present form.
Single sanction.
Think there needs to be more alternatives to the single sanction and think that the system is weakened by measures taken to avoid the single sanction.
Students seem naive about the consequences of their actions and somewhat aggressive about obtaining convictions regardless. Defense provided to accused does not seem adequate.
Violations are into reported in a uniform pattern, so like cases are not always treated alike. Also the system is too adversarial and time-consuming, so I'm inclined to treat first offenses in a more instructional and personal way. I would have no hesitation in reporting repeat offenders, though I would encourage them to self-report first.
The single sanction!
I'm not sure it is fully understood.
The single sanction. The lack of wide scale student support, given that it is supposed to be a student - governed system and not a faculty TA-driven system, as it appears now. The stories I hear from other professors about it, and the likelihood that graduate TAs are more apt to use the Honor System than faculty who've been here awhile suggests that the system is flawed (if people abandon it or become jaded about it as time goes on).

Q: C2

Because of not being able to proceed with what I felt in 2 cases were strong.
People shouldn't be kicked out for any offense.
Lack of no-tolerance clause for students. Tolerating cheating, etc. should itself be an honor violation, for that too undermines the community of trust. The very low rate of student referrals of cases shows students want the glory but not the responsibility of the Honor System. The Honor Committee is to be applauded for its work with faculty, and making changes to help us, but the real problem lies with changing student tolerance of cheating. Until the Honor System corrects these problems, it will continue to be something of a sham for most students.
I am not sure that students should be automatically dismissed. This is a major part of one's life. One mistake can cause a dramatic change in their lives forever.
Insufficient degrees of punishment make dealing with minor offenses difficult.
The complete dismissal of students and the surrender of degrees obtained are too harsh of punishment.
Single sanction is tough for juries .it allows a lot of cheating to be brought before a jury and found not guilty. This can be detrimental to the system as a whole because it sends a mixed message that though the penalties are severe the chance of conviction is not high. Students just don't want to dismiss others, often because of a perceived hypocrisy due to the fact that most students know of friends etc who have cheated and not been caught, so it is tough to dismiss someone for something that you know another person has done and gotten away with. That said, I think that a sentencing phase, such as would be required by a multi-sanction code is nearly as difficult to administer and define. In principle the single sanction seems best, but tends to limit the willingness of juries to convict.
Single sanction - a little too rough.
Faculty view the Honor trial as too cumbersome and discourage TAs who have no experience in it from pursuing a trial.
That it become a system of denunciation in which favors are played.
I don't think a student led Honor Systems work.
Students seem to rely on professors to do the work. That is, they will tell us about offenses but will not bring an action themselves. Very often we are not the ones that observe the cheating, if it exists.
I am not sure if it is explained well to new students. Then in class it is referred to as if everyone is fully knowledgeable of the system.
I already voted concerning this. I do not want the new addition that makes it even harder to change the single sanction. I also would want the decision procedure to involve faculty members as well as students.
Single sanction is too harsh.
Single sanction. I respect the reasoning behind it and think it is good if it worked in practice. Students don't report honor offenses not wanting to be the catalyst for having a student dismissed. I'm torn - the Honor System at UVA has a huge role in student's lives, and I think it's great that they think about it and single sanction does make them think (in theory).
I have heard that most decisions are taken by undergraduate students. There should be adequate representation by senior graduate students who would have more experience in such matters and would be able to take a more balanced non-partisan view. Such important decisions should not be left to peers alone.
The punishment is too heavy.
I don't know enough of the specifics that could end in a student being asked to leave the university.
I think that there should be other options when students are found guilty.
The process is too secret, the outcome to uncertain, and the single sanction is not always appropriate
I believe that students have neglected their responsibility for reporting honor violations and

Q: C2

have pushed that burden onto the faculty. This has undermined the community of trust at the University.
I think a wider range of sanctions would lead to more reporting of dishonest conduct.
I listed them in the answer to the previous question.
Should be applied more often and more aggressively to sexual misconduct and racist behavior.
I think students are reluctant to convict with the single sanction. I think they would be more likely to convict if they had multiple sanctions
I do not think guilty students are always punished because some feel the single sanction is too tough. Cheating has become so frequent that too many students don't think it warrants permanent expulsion.
Only one punishment for all offenses seems problematic.
I think that there should be different consequences of being found guilty of an honor offense (other than dismissal from school) depending on the severity of the offense.
The punishment is too extreme and there should different punishment for different violations.
Primarily the single sanction policy. I believe the system should allow flexibility in matching the punishment to the offense. The severity of the current single sanction policy would give me hesitation in bringing what I might consider to be a minor offense before the committee
One sanction rule troubling, unjustly applied.
There are some uncertainties that need to be addressed by the professor of the course. If you are not sure whether or not working together is considered cheating or to what level one can work together or find outside sources, these are things that the professor needs to explicitly address. Some professors hold dear the Honor Code, but to the students, many actions could be construed as cheating or simply as completing the assignment.
As it operates now I believe the System reflects the values of a previous age. I would like to see an Honor System. But to establish it now, in this culture, would require much more regular education, much more regular discussion and an expanded sense of its educational as well as regulatory role.
In nearly 30 years at the University, I have seen too many examples of honor offenses trivialized by debates over reprehensibility and obfuscations introduced by outside attorneys.
Single sanction is too inflexible.
I do not like the single sanction. I do not like the fact that the totally student-run format can be highly unprofessional at times.
Should not be an all or nothing punishment.
Cheating occurs regularly due to lack of proctoring sanction systems harsh penalty deters reporting.
Adversarial nature and time commitment. Perception that faculty are put on trial (I have no direct experience - heard from others)
Single sanction student responsibility for preserving atmosphere of trust.
I believe the students are bias in their application of the Honor System. Women, minorities, and athletes are the usual accuse. Members of white fraternities and sororities are hardly ever accused. The disproportionate rate which traditional Greek versus others does not garner much integrity of the system.
Concerns with the single sanction - students have to learn about honor after a mistake at another institution. Low student reporting undermines the system.
Like democracy, the fact that it is the best of many alternatives does not mean it always works well (Winston Churchill's observation, not mine). As a faculty member, I would have serious reservations about involving the Honor Committee with my own classes or students, yet I would say that I support the system's presence on the campus.
That students will just tell me that they were sick so they could not come to class freely and many times over the semester.
Oppose single sanction.

Q: C2

<p>The one-strike-out policy seems too harsh.</p>
<p>I believe in a second chance system. This was offered in my own undergraduate institution, Johns Hopkins University. There, a student found guilty of a first offence received an F in the course, was blacklisted (the permanent record was marked with the reason for failure), required to repeat the course, and could not score higher than a D on the repeat. A second honor violation resulted in dismissal from the University.</p>
<p>Because of the single sanction, we need to decide whether the problem justifies the possible outcome and whether the problem justifies the time and effort required to pursue an honor case.</p>
<p>I am totally against the single sanction. It is a remnant of the 'dark ages' for this university.</p>
<p>If students themselves do not support the System more, it ultimately won't work. Students reporting their peers.</p>
<p>The entire system seems clunky and ineffectual. I have been discouraged from doing anything about cheating (other than speaking directly with the student) because I have been told that the entire system is difficult to get through and often leads to a dead end.</p>
<p>I believe a single sanction is rather harsh. I also find it amazing that lying cheating and stealing are honors offenses but assault is not.</p>
<p>I do not like the way the Honor System affects helping students with rough drafts of their papers. I would like to be able to give them more concrete advice without violating the received assistance clause in the honor pledge. I am also uncomfortable with the fact that I cannot speak to a student if I suspect him / her of cheating. I would rather hear the student's view first, before I have to contact the relevant authorities. Finally, I have heard from fellow TAs (and professors) that bringing an honor charge is no longer an effective way to deal with cheating -- too many students have been let off for psychological stress and the instructor comes away with egg on his / her face.</p>
<p>Single sanction limits its usefulness.</p>
<p>I don't think it's a really strong deterrent, but it's a lot better than nothing. I like to give open-book take-home tests (unlimited time for a week) and suspect cheating by a very few. The benefits, for the students who do follow the rules, outweigh the negatives. Of course I could be wrong, and be regarded by the student grapevine as a guy to go to if you want a cheat-friendly class.</p>
<p>If students cheat on assignments, they cannot learn the materials. Cheating is a disadvantage for students who are supposed be here to gain knowledge. I think not cheating is a common sense and need not be enforced.</p>
<p>My understanding is that instances of cheating have been punished inconsistently. I am not sure that undergraduates have the experience or maturity to deal with Honor Code violations.</p>
<p>At its present form the system does not wisely use the time of involved parties</p>
<p>The single sanction policy gives me pause. My impression - at least in my field - is that outright cheating (on papers, for example) is pretty hard to do. I tend to suspect that plagiarism, for instance - in my classes, is more a reflection of carelessness or ignorance, than a failure of honor.</p>
<p>Single sanction is just too simplistic, and may punish some minor infractions too severely. If anyone else (including the President of our country) can make a mistake and be allowed to continue, why treat our students so differently.</p>
<p>I do not think that it is evenly or fairly applied, especially by the students in regard to their fellow students.</p>
<p>The system would work if the students really participated. The students of 2006 seem to reject the notion of turning in a fellow student. Therefore, the traditional system in which the faculty / TA's are police results. This is unfortunate.</p>
<p>I think small instances of cheating (copying homework, using an unauthorized text on a take-home quiz) are extremely common and need to be stopped. But the current system isn't designed to handle these relatively low significance problems. I have over 150 students. If I</p>

Q: C2

brought charges every time I knew someone cheated I would just have to move into Newcomb Hall.
Permanent ban from University.
I don't believe the students have the same fear / respect for it as we did in the 70s.
The severity of punishment may make it unlikely that some students who should be convicted of violations will not be and that some community members who suspect violations will not report them.
The single sanction. I feel permanent dismissal is too high a price to pay for first time offenders.
The single sanction policy, as I understand it, seems harsh though often justified.
Single sanction should be changed. Each case should be viewed independently. The single sanction results in unintended negative consequences for the community of trust.
There doesn't seem to be any middle ground. My understanding is that the only punishment is permanent dismissal, which is not the proper punishment for all infractions of the Honor Code.
I believe the refusal to change the single sanction has eroded very seriously the effectiveness of the Honor System as a means of policing academic integrity.
The role of bias has not been adequately addressed, especially possible racial bias.
Paradoxically, anyone who is comfortable violating the Honor Code is also likely to be comfortable pledging the Honor Code.
I am not sure that a single sanction is appropriate.
Dismissal of the student is a too serious consequence when the cheating is on a minor assignment.
My impression is that it is a first-strike-and-out system. I think that a lesser penalty for a first offense might be better - make it easier for people to turn in offenders.
Single sanction.
Need more information / experience with it.
The Honor System is a significant part of UVa's history, and shouldn't be dismissed lightly. However, the truth is that the system was conceived at a time when the University was still small, the student body was largely homogenous, and the concept of honor held a different meaning in the culture at large. As UVa has grown into a modern research university with thousands of students, faculty, and staff, student life has become much more anonymous and the sense of community is not as strong, which fosters an attitude of live and let live. Under these circumstances, students have little to gain and a lot to lose by initiating an honor case. This attitude, it seems to me, is the chief weakness of the Honor System in its present form.
I think that too much use of take-home exams puts expectations on students that are too high for some to bear, particularly international students accustomed to different norms of behavior.
It doesn't seem as though the students take it seriously or that they see any punishment for dishonorable actions. In a university where the disorderly conduct in the evenings is downright encouraged, there is no standard for an honorable lifestyle. How can I expect my students to follow university law when it is public knowledge that UVa students break state law with their extracurricular actions involving underage drinking, drunk driving, open containers, littering, public intoxication among other violations of simple human respect and decency? Any claim I could make about UVA students being honorable through and through would be a hollow statement. I give my students the benefit of the doubt, but at the same time, I do not trust them enough to give them enough opportunity to cheat on assignments or tests.
I think that the single sanction is too harsh for some Honor Code violations, and that leads to jury nullification.
I don't like the single sanction.



Q: C2

It is not consistently respected or invoked by teachers. Students do not seem to be aware of it. The entire notion of honor seems to entail personal pride and obedience, rather than the merely punitive nature of the current system.
Should be more broadly inclusive of offenses (including sexual assault and hate crimes).
It's different from what I experienced as an undergrad and I don't think it's a system that encourages enforcement.
Not fully clear to me my role. A lot is riding on the single sanction. I am more likely to take matters into my own hands and punish students on my own on a case-by-case basis.
Single sanction: need more flexibility.
I suspect only a portion of violators get caught. Those that do are the examples for others but only their lives are affected.
The single sanction is too harsh. There are more effective ways to deal with first violations. Just as important, I think that there is confusion about the value of collaborative work. I do not mean work that is assigned to be done collaboratively, but in general, I encourage all my students to talk freely about their idea, share these with the whole class and feel free to take for your own any idea that is appropriate to your work. Since I will work very closely with all my students I am perfectly aware of the flow of ideas and would know if this were somehow abused. But, if this process is not explained carefully there can be misunderstanding. While I do explain this, I also worry that the general message of the Honor System is that people work alone.
As previously stated - one size fits all is not always appropriate and may limit effectiveness.
Single sanction.
The single-sanction rule doesn't allow for any flexibility (re. the seriousness of the offenses). I'd prefer more options in the way of penalties.
Too hard to get a guilty verdict, not worth the effort even when cheating is obvious.
When I was in college, the only thing that was considered worse than cheating was telling university faculty or officials that someone else was cheating. This, of course, is not a good thing and there was no Honor Code where I went to school. It just makes me suspicious that even at UVa, cheating, etc., probably is underreported.
It is not clear to me that the process treats all students fairly. That is, are minority students more likely to cheat or is the system punishing them more harshly? Until such issues are resolved I will be reluctant to report students to the Honors committee.
It takes a long time and many, many meetings to process one case. Very low efficiency.
The process is tedious and involves severe time commitment on faculty pursuing charges.
The Honor System would work better and teachers would be more supportive of it if not for single sanction.
I'm not sure how I feel about the single sanction policy, especially in cases where a student may not have intended to violate the Honor Code.
I do not like the single sanction rule because there gradations of seriousness of infractions. I also do not think that sanctions are imposed as often as they should be because of the single sanction rule.
Tough to prove dishonor and if a student makes one mistake (and we all have made mistakes) s/he can suffer serious consequences for that one mistake.
It is hard to quantify an Honor Code violation when it comes to design disciplines [architecture, art, performing arts]. It would need to be reformulated / restated / reinforced in a different way. It should apply to dishonorable behavior in a broader sense, and not only to the exam setting.
The system is not about single sanction, it is about honor! Accept the system and act like we believe it is important.
Single sanction does not reflect the realities of our society
Like I said, I think people tend to be overly reliant on the Honor System, and place too much faith in student's moral rectitude and resistance to cheating. I think monitoring is still needed

Q: C2

and careful attention should be placed in ensuring that students are not cheating in exams or otherwise.
Single sanction expulsion.
It seems that minority students are over-represented as far as the number of honor trials. These cases are often dismissed, but it puts students through a great deal of stress.
If a student cheated and was found guilty, but not expelled from the University, then there isn't any further action taken. There's nothing to stop the student from cheating again, and it doesn't deter other students from cheating.
Single sanction is a BIG problem. Students have left the initiation of honors offences in the laps of faculty and TAs, even though they are the ones who witness honors offences much more directly and much more frequently. It is a student run system that has devolved into a faculty nightmare.
For some violations the penalty can be too severe, especially for 18 - 19 year old undergraduates.
The single sanction.
I am a bit concerned that decisions of such permanent consequences lie entirely in the hands of students who may lack an appreciation of the due process considerations that should inform decisions of such magnitude. I also would like to see the possibility for readmission of students who recognize their error and make a serious effort at rehabilitation, say through two years of Peace Corps service or a tour in the military.
Student zeal for conviction being a driving force rather than pursuit of truth and justice. Some Honor Committee members may be somewhat immature to be dealing with such weighty issues. Difficulty for jury members to understand technicalities of some material. The mechanism that once turned over, a case may not be rescinded. The extreme nature of the single sanction combined with cited reservations leaves me wondering if I should entrust the system with a student's future. Another reservation is that an accused student may easily seek a psychiatric excuse. I worry, too, about the education of our international students regarding the nature of the system. Finally, there is no room for redemption on the part of an offending student. I might expect a prevailing view that an offender will always be an offender, but I believe our undergraduate students in particular are still developing morally.
Well, I haven't ever really thought about it, i.e. what an Honor Code means to me, and if it's desirable and/or realistic to make it such a prominent aspect of the University. In some ways it feels a little outdated, in an old school, gentlemen's chivalry sort of way. I'm not saying that honor / truth, etc are outdated, but maybe I'm cynical about pushing them so vocally, i.e. loudly. Aren't those things that people cultivate within themselves, they value or they don't, apart from what's trumpeted around them? It seems in some ways a little arrogant or pretentious to make a big deal of it, but then again, there are plenty of examples around us in everyday life of dishonorable actions, maybe my quiet approach is also naive, and misses opportunities to educate, and either seed or nurture honesty where it is needed, clearly I haven't got a well-thought-out opinion yet on what I think about an / the Honor System at UVa.
Dismissal seems overly severe for some infractions.
Single sanction.
It does not work. Students do not report other students for the most part. The faculty is expected to police the system.
Single sanction hurdles to action.
I don't think it's going to stop people who cheat but it's a good thing to have.
What I support is a norm of integrity among students. To the extent that the Honor System contributes to that, I support it.
I think the single sanction leads to many problems if a case ever comes to investigation and trial. Faculty members have voiced this opinion for years in multiple surveys and have been ignored. I am also disturbed by a holier than thou attitude exhibited by honor supporters.
I am not a teaching assistant.

An Honor System affects students' behavior in class to a certain extent, but to cheat or not to cheat has always been a question of personal responsibility and of how much they value their knowledge.
Reporting of honor violations by students seem to be selective.
System does not provide enough options.
Because the penalties are so severe, I believe there is resistance to reporting and finding a guilty verdict.
The single sanction. It seems to create significant problems for me as a teacher in that it does not allow the student to become educated in honor...and sadly, I think that it is a pretty abstract concept for most until they make a slip. I am all in favor of severe penalties, but expulsion in many cases is too severe for the level of infraction I encounter often. On several occasions I have dropped the student one or two letter grades plus a zero on the assignment. Our cheating incidents tend to take place on homework assignments.
I think the classes where tests are given at home or term papers are used, cheating will always occur. Those inclined will find it easy, those not inclined to cheat will be fine. The Honor System works well for those students caught and reported. The expulsion as punishment is appropriate.
Severity of the punishment.
The single penalty system may be too rigid and lead to lack of reporting of borderline instances.
Single sanction is a bad idea. Not because I think that it is too harsh for a cheater, but because it causes the Honor Committee to find too many loopholes for students who have cheated. It is not administered so as to prevent corruption. I know of cases in which the committee in which the Honor Committee waited as long as SIX WEEKS before notifying a student of the charge. As a result, students sometimes have time to find out unofficially about the impending charge and make a voluntary confession/retraction. There should be a rule REQUIRING prompter notification. I have been hearing about such corruption of the system for ten years (ever since I've been at UVa). Something should have been done long ago.
Cheating on assignments and tests seem to be the most popular reason for expelling a student from school. I think that there are worse crimes than that, such as, sexual assaults, that are not that severely punished. In a way, seems like the University has its priorities mixed up. Is a cheating student more harmful than a sexual predator?
Single sanction.
I just feel there needs to be some more definite rules without recourse to appeal in those situations.
I would like the Honor System to have more than a single sanction.
I don't believe that it is fairly applied to all students.
Many students do not understand what Honor is. Many students complain about Honor offenses but do not report them. Some students believe the Honor System supercedes the authority of faculty to maintain a standard of academic integrity. The single sanction. Justice without mercy is not justice. Students in particular should be held to account, but given opportunity to make satisfaction for an offense, and seek personal reformation. Expulsion should be reserved for very serious offenses or habitual offenders.
I don't know if a violation should result in that student not being able to hold a degree from the university, even if they have already obtained one.
I don't think students should take exams home that are closed book.
It is an imperfect system, as most Honor Systems are. But I like studying and working in an environment where honesty is assumed instead of its opposite. Cheaters take advantage of this, no doubt, but I think there will always be cheaters. At least this way the rest of the students aren't punished for it.
Instructors should give students reasonable assignments instructor should not be afraid of political correctness - this fear may lead to giving students overwhelming detailed emptiness

Q: C2

in order not to see enemies in students an instructor needs to be sure he / she will not be a subject of students' scrutiny (as a result of political correctness) to prevent the HS turn into a formality there is a need for a carefully verbalized Honor System philosophy.
Hard to police.
Single sanction.
Single sanction seems too limited and yields some unjust results.
The single sanction ruling seems, perhaps, not to address the nuances of some of the honor offences.
Single sanction.
I don't absolutely believe in a single sanction. I think different levels of severity should be taken into account, if a student cheats.
I have serious reservations about the single sanction. Because the single sanction is perceived as a very harsh penalty, I believe that the students are extremely reluctant to convict. Furthermore, in my decades here, some students seemed to me to be convicted for rather minor offenses and other students not convicted for very serious academic dishonesty. As a consequence, I believe that many of the faculty perceive the system as quite uneven in its administration.
There should probably be a bit more flexibility in the sanctions system, but not very much more. I can see the usefulness of a moderately liberalized sanction system that would include two rather than just one level of sanction, but I think that in general the University should continue to toe a hard line against plagiarism and I am strongly in favor of maintaining a conception of honor as the keynote of academic and social life at UVa.
I've observed students with a lack of respect for others, their environment, and themselves. I don't know if the Honor Code truly follows through with these things.
I think the reluctance of students to come forward to turn in those who they see cheating, and the reluctance of student juries to convict mean that students who are prepared to cheat realize that there is a good chance of getting away with it. So I feel I need to proctor exams and can't really rely on students to enforce the code themselves.
I'm not sure how many students are being reported because of the single sanction. Is it being applied?
I see that having to tell the name of a partner in class if you see him / her cheating is pretty scary for students, because if the rest of the students find out the one who told the professor will be rejected by a great majority of his / her partners. It is important for the students to feel comfortable in their studies in order to achieve their goals. Putting them in the situation of being guilty just because of not telling the name of other person is a strong responsibility for them.

**Q C3: What are your main concerns about the Honor System? (Asked only of those who are neutral or somewhat oppose the Honor System)**

I don't like the idea that students need to report each other.
Single sanction for cheating. The penalty does not fit the crime. Also because of the strict penalty the burden of evidence is too great.
It is dying. To protect itself, the BOV considers the committee members to be administrators, and the committee hides that fact from the students. That given the above, in some cases the BOV might allow dishonorable behavior by the committee. That some committee members constantly talk about forcing the Honor Code and the students to fit their definition of honor rather than the student's concepts (i.e. drinking). That the students no longer instigate most of the cases. That the size of the school increased dramatically with no similar increase in convictions. The spotlight effect and fairness of the system.
All the professors and TA's I know will not report cheating to the Honor Committee - they will simply deal with the case themselves, because of the hassle involved, and the often poor

Q: C3

outcomes of Honor cases.
Should be limited to academic matters, single sanction option limits usefulness.
I've heard that it's next to impossible to get a conviction because there's only one penalty, namely dismissal. But if you pursue a minor incident and the student is acquitted for lack of seriousness, then he's essentially innocent, even though he clearly cheated.
The main points of the trials should be made public without revealing the names so that public opinion would react to bad decisions.
Rigidity, narrow focus of charges, leaving out many horrific acts, subject to abuse and discriminatory enforcement.
I think involving students is a laudable goal. But there should be a professional staff that handles academic violations. This would allow for continuity, but also would help to restore a measure of professionalism to the system. Additionally, the single sanction is, in my opinion, wholly inappropriate for most honor violations. Suspension, with an indication on the record, plus community service would often seem to be a better sentence.
The Honor System is more concerned with creating the appearance of honor than its reality. The single sanction rule is too harsh and therefore unenforceable. Reforms are needed, but the students involved with the Honor System don't want to be perceived as weakening it. So the reforms never pass. Also, the administration likes the Honor System because it is popular with alumni. {NAME} who did more than anyone to help expose the weaknesses of the system has been treated badly. He should be honored for exposing the system's soft spots.
The single sanction means that guilty students are often found not guilty.
I don't like the single sanction. I don't think that looking up a formula in order to complete an assignment is comparable to plagiarizing a term paper.
I don't believe the students believe in it.
Professors seem reluctant to tell the truth due to the fact that research is so heavily stressed on their time at the university that they don't want anymore time taken up.
That its inflexibility (single sanction, capital punishment or exoneration) in effect makes the tender-minded students who administer it highly reluctant to impose sanction in cases of intellectual crime.
I do not support the single sanction - I think a more reasonable approach would be failure of a class for a first offense, and removal from the university for a second offense.
Single Sanction. Draconian and anachronistic. How do you explain seriousness as an out through any other reason than a jury not wanting to kick out a student (as in the recent case of two students who were clearly cheating and found as such by a jury of their peers)? Yet they are still here and exonerated. Amazing.
It is impractical. Seems like most instructors do not want to get involved in the Honor System.
Single sanction makes students reticent to find guilt, the process takes forever.
I have talked with lots of grad students and faculty who share my concerns that the Honor System makes it too difficult to prove guilt, punishes faculty/instructors for trying, and lets the guilty off. The single sanction is too strict (and therefore not used) so that most instructors deal with it privately - by talking to the student, demanding resubmission, or failing someone on the assignment. I think the Honor Code is almost meaningless, although it still means a lot to many students. Frankly, I think racial and sexual assaults should be Honor offences that are prosecuted and result in expulsion. I wish there was a way for the University to compel students to divulge who commits hate crimes, so that it could punish them appropriately.
The expectation that students are held accountable if they don't report fellow students, and the supposed single sanction (expulsion).
The primary foundation of the Honor Code is that all students are basically good people and do not cheat. I think this is a faulty premise upon which to base a system. Cheating is a rampant problem at nearly all universities nationwide. There is no legitimate reason to

believe that students at UVa are any more honorable than any other institution. The fact that UVA is a top-ranked school, with some of the most competitive students in the country, only suggests that if anything, cheating would be more commonplace here than elsewhere. Furthermore, I do not like the one offense and done policy. It is my opinion that students should be given two chances, minimum. I also believe the nature of the offense should be considered in determining appropriate punishment. For example, I do not believe non-intentional, internet plagiarism, should be punished the same as committing an off-grounds felony. This is senseless and baseless. I think students who commit lesser offenses should have the chance to redeem themselves through community service, and partaking in an honor seminar. Perhaps by the second or third offense, suspension or expulsion should occur.

The lack of consistency from year to year, largely resulting from the lack of institutional memory. I also find that many people view the Honor Code as a rule of membership in the UVa country club rather than as preparation for life outside the university.

Seems to be too complicated to initiate and then, if I had initiated it, am not sure how complicated and time-consuming the process would be. Easier to take some action on the personal level than to go through the system.

The punishment does not fit the crime.

Single sanction. Selective: does not seem to do anything about the outrageous (often drunken) behavior of the fraternities, which the school seems to support wholeheartedly.

It is witchcraft system, and faculty are the ones who should be helping students through this phase of their lives, the good and bad parts.

I support the concept and ideals of the Honor System and am proud of those students who adhere to it. Over the last 25 years, however, students have become much more reluctant to sanction those who violate the code. Even when cases reach the Honor Committee, ludicrous defenses are often accepted in acquitting cheaters. Simultaneously, the burden of prosecuting violations appears to have been shifted from the students to the faculty. To me, the {NAME} case was a shameful failure of both the student body and the administration to take responsibility for the system they loudly promote. The Honor System today is obviously dysfunctional insofar as the fraction of cheaters who are prosecuted and convicted. This is not just my opinion. In the April 17, 2003 Cavalier Daily, a survey of student behavior related to the Honor System, was released. The survey revealed that: 5% of students admit to having committed an honor offense; 20% more claim they maybe committed an offense or weren't sure. The 5% is consistent with estimates of the number of (probably) habitual cheaters in my department's large undergraduate courses. It's also consistent with {NAME} experience in his Physics course. The 20% of others who might have committed an offense is more surprising. If we conservatively assume that only half of those actually did something wrong, then a total of 15% of the student body violate the Honor System. If the system were working efficiently, those people wouldn't receive a UVa degree - implying a conviction / expulsion rate of about 4% of the student body, or over 400 undergraduates, each year (!) Given that a typical year produces only about 20 honor trials and fewer than 10 convictions, it's clear there is a fantastic mismatch between actual behavior and honor sanctions. The system is obviously dysfunctional. I believe that most of this astonishing shortfall is due to the single-sanction policy of the Honor System. Many UVa professors are exasperated by the ineffectiveness of the Honor System in dealing with transgressors. And rather than become entangled with the system, they have implemented their own punishments in the form of failing grades. If the University wants to save the Honor System, it had better convince its students to live up to their own proclaimed standards.

Too black and white. Often disconnected from graduate components of the university and the legal system.

I have heard from colleagues that they have caught students unequivocally, spent a day or more sitting in on the hearing, only to have the committee dismiss the charges. I have heard many students say that they would not report any but the most egregious offense because of the single penalty.

Time consuming.

Q: C3

Too much work to proceed to trial. Trials are lengthily and drawn out and occur on weekends added burden on faculty who have many tasks to complete clear violations are dismissed as being not serious.
Single sanction.
Student judgment - students say it is okay to cheat on a quiz, but not on an exam. Single sanction.
Single sanction. It can be a career ending process for a non-tenure faculty.
I think there was a very bad case of abuse of the Honor System by a professor in my department, and the graduate students are paying the price. The system should not permit this type of abuse.
Well, as we saw in the last public trial, cheaters can be guilty of act and intent, but not seriousness. The professors in my department are skeptical of initiating honor cases without absolutely strong and incontrovertible evidence. I would like to say, though, that in the years I have taught at UVa, I have felt that the majority of students in my classes have not cheated. I am only somewhat opposed to the Honor Code because the system does not prevent cheating.
I am very committed to an Honor Code and value the freedom (for students and faculty) that it affords. Although I have never filed an Honor complaint, I have never heard a faculty member speak positively about the experience or the outcome of the Honor Process. I take the Honor Code seriously, but am committed to handling offenses on my own until there is significant reform.
I don't like the policy of (as I understand it) definite expulsion as a result of conviction of any honor offense, no matter how minor. And though I am new here, I have also heard concerns that minority students are accused of honor offenses disproportionately more often than white students. Though I'm not at all sure if this is true, I find it disturbing to hear.
Not administered effectively. Incredible time commitment and students are often unwilling to find their peers guilty. Single sanction means that a huge percentage of infractions either go unreported or are unpunished.
The Honor System requires that students behave honorably. I am not sure all of them are up to the challenge that this requires.
UVa students want to brag about their student-run system, but they do not want to carry the burden of actually reporting cheating (sure, some do, but not enough). The single sanction interferes with the operation of the system at many levels. In a digital age, cheating is simply easier. In a multi-cultural university, you lack the peer pressures to uphold honor, and universities today are about granting credentials (not learning), so the Honor Code really appears rather quaint.
That it may not be as effective as others believe.
It's based on the premise that a student's work is private property, it discourages collaboration, instilling fears of sharing information and knowledge among students who would do it responsibly and yet does not prevent other students from cheating in the sense that they prefer to blindly copy something rather than actively learn.
The single sanction. Racism. The Honor System propagates a passive conception of academic honesty. When students are presumed honorable until they violate the community of trust, we define the community of trust negatively, in reaction to an infraction.
Single sanction and unequal application of verdicts by student juries because of unclear standards of guilt, degree of severity or seriousness of offense, bias.
The (apparent) inflexibility.
Clumsiness, lack of student commitment to it. (I went to a small college with an Honor Code. Ours was taken much more seriously than UVa's, in the sense that students CARED. At my college almost all exams were take-home, and I'm sure there was less cheating than at UVa. UVa has the Honor Code from tradition, not from real belief.)
Time, reasonable doubt, and what appears to be a seriousness clause leads to guilty verdicts without punishment, time.

Single sanction is unrealistic. Single sanction means students are very reluctant to report incidents, confess, or to convict peers; and the result is that faculty don't trust the system because it very clearly doesn't work.
Students are not obligated to report cheating. Why should faculty be cops in a system where students are the judiciary? If student self-governance is the order of the day, then students need to govern all the time not just when it leads to the inconvenient reporting of friends. If students are unwilling to shoulder the time cost and liability of reporting, why should faculty?
The single sanction is indefensible. Generally, the system should be more controlled and supervised by faculty and administrators. I have known some students who were *very* involved in the Honor System and would not want them serving as adjudicators (I am certain there are terrific students too). On a less substantive note, the honor man poem should be excised; the honor man does not pursue a woman to her tears? Really, it's an anachronism.
Unwillingness of students to report one another and the politicizing of the process.
The single sanction is not an acceptable solution. We're a University, if we are not able to be discerning, subtle, and fair, who will be? I don't believe it can be run only by students. Not that I don't trust the students' integrity (although some do cheat) but because I think University business should also be run faculty and administrators. This is a community problem. The whole community should pitch in.
Single sanction works against the community of trust and undermines system. Lack of student-initiated cases is a serious indictment of the system.
I really don't like the single-sanction system. I think it ties the hands of the committee in many cases.
I have already noted my concerns about student reporting, about the very notion of expelling the dishonorable, and about the single sanction. Basically I would far, far prefer a frankly punitive system that spelled out different punishments for different infractions rather than the (to me) silly attempt to classify a few students as hopelessly dishonorable, bad apples who need to be expelled. As if all the rest of the student body are therefore honorable? I fear that most students in fact would cheat if they felt there was no punishment for it, that under enough pressure most would give in to the temptation to do something wrong (dishonorable), and that therefore the whole system rests upon a false understanding of human nature and a self-righteousness among the supposedly honorable that I find loathsome. I do cooperate with the system because it's all we've got, but I regard the system as dangerously flawed, for all the reasons given here and in my previous answers.
Student jury nullification Presenting false IDs to get alcohol tolerated Faculty who bring Honor charges often wind up disillusioned. Faculty treat the Honor System as if it absolves them of any need to police their courses for cheating.
I'm not convinced about the single sanction approach.
Once again: to kick a student out for one offense means that you'll only kick out a tiny handful of people who ought to at least receive some kind of acknowledgement that their behavior is questionable and should be changed, and it turns the entire procedure into a kind of witch trial. By that, expelling a particular individual becomes a rite of exorcism - perhaps psychologically helpful for the current students, but at what price?
In one case I requested tapes or transcripts of the I-panel hearing, because a student had radically altered their story for the trial, but was told that the recording apparatus had malfunctioned during the I-panel hearing so that my request could not be honored.
Student managed court proceedings are a farce. This is not undergraduate Court TV. It should always be the professor's (or instructor's) responsibility to pursue an honor charge - never the TA's. As a TA, I would never pursue an honor violation. I would always refer the matter to the professor and drop it entirely if he / she did not agree to take charge. And single sanction is draconian and must to be changed before the system will be uniformly enforced - the fact that there are students on campus who have been charged with assault and battery - and remain students - while students who have cheated are thrown out (and, for international students - made to leave the USA) is absurd.
The very severe and absolute penalty after a guilty verdict discourages educators from



Q: C3

reporting suspected cheaters, because we are not really interested in destroying a student's life or future prospects. I have heard from other faculty that it is time-consuming, unpleasant, and ultimately discouraging to report suspected cheaters and to go through an Honor trial. As a result of these reports I have never done so myself. I have heard that Honor trials and especially guilty verdicts go disproportionately to minority students. There is confusion and possibly incoherence in the question what a faculty member should actually do if they suspect someone is cheating in their class. We have been told we are entitled to give such a student the appropriate grade (i.e., an F) but that we cannot make an actual accusation of cheating unless we are prepared to go to the Honor Committee. But if we give an F on work that is otherwise acceptable because we know it was obtained by cheating, isn't that the same as an accusation of cheating? I wonder whether I would be failing to conform to the dictates of the Honor System if I gave an F because I suspected cheating, but did not report the student to the Honor Committee. All in all, I do not feel there is much I can do about suspected violations short of actually bringing an Honor charge, and I am unwilling to do that for the reasons already given (I suspect that the process will be time-consuming and unpleasant for me, I suspect that the outcome will be discouraging either because the student will be acquitted on some technicality or because s/he will not be acquitted and will have to leave the university - a punishment too drastic and severe to have my support).

Students ignore it by cheating (or by not taking action when others cheat). It at once disempowers the instructor (who cannot simply fail the student and have the students withdraw) and demands too much of the instructor (the honor trial, the many ways students can get out of it).

To be effective members of society, students need to learn to work together. I encourage (and sometimes even require) students to look at each other's work and to borrow ideas. The Honor Code discourages group synergy, and thus has a negative effect on creative, collaborative disciplines.

The people sitting in judgment are students; they need to be faculty members with expertise in a field relevant to the particular case or at least a more sophisticated level of education. Student judges are more leery of actually condemning their peers; faculty would be more objective and detached. Also, in more minor cases of plagiarism which are more due to ignorance of proper citation than to malice, a faculty member ought to be in a position to impose her own penalties within the framework of the particular case, not submit the case to an outside board and a lengthy process: sometimes a short sharp shock is infinitely more effective.

**Q C5: How do you think the system should be changed? (Asked only of those who said the Honor System should be changed)**

We need a real Honor System, in which students really participate. Single sanction means that students have no capacity to act with the subtlety that most rather complex and variable violations of honor requires. So they do not act at all. Students who venerate the tradition need to get over it. There is little unique about honor here (except single sanction) and many institutions have much more effective and serious honor regimes.

First of all, do away with single sanction. Second, the honor court should not be the first (or only) place for faculty to deal with plagiarism or cheating. Third, I've been appalled that other forms of student conduct (including date rape, assault, hate crimes) are not part of the Honor Code while cheating and lying are totally over-emphasized, and I think the Honor Committee would be a better place to address student-to-student conduct than simply student-to-faculty conduct.

The Honor System is broken, because of the combination of the seriousness clause and the single sanction. Any minor offense will not result in the single sanction, so the students know full well that they won't be removed from the University as a result of cheating. This makes the Honor System completely worthless to faculty instructors. Either the single sanction should be removed (meaning that if somebody cheats on a homework, they get some

punishment) or the Honor Committee should start being stricter and apply the single sanction to any cheating offense. But the combination of the single sanction and the seriousness clause makes the system useless.
Get rid of the single sanction find a way to make sure that students will turn each other in.
I would like to see a system that students would really support. Such a system would place all honor enforcement in the hands of the students rather than assigning the responsibility to faculty while retaining the authority for students. The majority of students are currently unwilling to support the current system. The lack of support may be due to the single severe sanction, or it may be due to the current nature of the student society. I do not know what changes would re-establish a real student-run Honor System, but I would strongly support an effort in this direction.
It is my belief that student juries do not take academic integrity seriously and have lower expectations of academic integrity than do faculty members. The single sanction is probably a major source of the trivializing of academic integrity.
Get rid of single sanction! Punish students according to the severity of their crime.
Get ride of single sanction. Put more responsibility on the students to report offenses.
Since the burden is on faculty members to initiate most cases, faculty must have membership on the committees that actually impose sanctions. And the single sanction must be replaced by a system of graduated sanctions that better reflect the seriousness of different kinds of honor infractions.
I think the single sanction is wrong, is unfair to students and faculty and discourages reports of Honors offenses. No legal system would ever have a single penalty for all crimes. The system needs to be changed so that there are scaled variety of penalties tailored to the particular offenses and the circumstances of that offense's). This would also allow additional things to be covered within the Honor System, such as sexual assault.
Single sanction is an overly harsh penalty and has the potential to render injustice in certain situations. I don't think the Honor System should be student run. It should be run by faculty and / or administrators, and it should allow for a greater number of penalties to fit the crimes other than just expulsion.
Get rid of the single sanction, stop talking about Virginia traditions and start talking about integrity in work and interpersonal behavior, develop a system of graduated, relatively severe punishments, publicize all honor violations.
The single sanction must go. All acts of cheating must be deemed serious.
Faculty should be given some standing in the system. Currently it seems that the word and / or evidence of the faulty is meaningless in cases. Tiered system of punishment.
Remove the single sanction. Involve adults in the process. Make toleration of honor violations an honor offense.
Dual sanction - as proposed by the Arts and Sciences faculty a year and a half ago. First offense suspension for a year, second offense permanent expulsion.
Get rid of the single sanction.
Abolish the use of expulsion as a sanction.
A bottom-up reformation is needed involving tiered sanctions such that punishments can fit the crimes. Tiered sanctions would allow cases that are clearly an honor violation, yet tolerated because of their commonplace occurrence (such as the use of fake IDs - with its subsequent jeopardizing of the server and establishment - and cheating on low-level assignments). At present, the system is dysfunctional simply because the weight of the sanction prevents juries from finding students guilty, and because students from wealthier backgrounds are likely to be involved in the type of infractions (minor cheating and lying related to IFC activities) that are more commonly accepted as not threatening the community of trust.
Get rid of take-home exams. There is enormous pressure on other faculty to give take-home exams and these invite cheating that is almost impossible to monitor.
Get rid of the single sanction. Apply it to all dishonorable behavior, including sexual assault.

Q: C5

Have more faculty involvement or perhaps even outside involvement from a third party. Actually, I would start on an even lower level. If the professor clearly states the Honor Code on the syllabus and the student breaks that code, then there should be no need for a trial. Let the student try to deal with the situation one on one with the professor and / or with a neutral mediator. The University should back its professors. I'm not saying they are always correct but in the current system, professors would rather allow some degree of cheating then going to a 12-hour or more trial, a 6-hour appeal, and a 14-hour retrial.

Drop the automatic single sanction. That should be for especially egregious offenses. First time, minor offenses should face a year suspension.

Students need better orientation. When I was Department Chair from 1993-1998, we had to beg for an Honor System orientation for our grad students. They, as many others I suspect, were expected to buy into a system that was never explained to them. Students need to take responsibility for a system that used to be student run, simple and clear. If you saw or knew someone who has lied, cheated or stolen something, you turned them in. You cannot have an Honor System when students turn a blind eye to dishonorable activities and then expect faculty to do the dirty work. If a student does not turn in someone who has violated the Honor Code, they have also violated the Honor Code. If students won't agree to these three things, the Honor System will remain a sham. FYI: I graduated from UVa in 1978 and so appreciated the Honor System then. My experience as an undergrad was markedly different than my friends at other universities. When I went to graduate school at Cornell, I was saddened at the pressure undergrads felt to cheat in order to compete. The current state of the Honor System is depressing and disheartening.

Adopt the forgiveness clause. Keep the single sanction, to satisfy the alumni and the traditionalists - and to keep an inspiring tradition - but humanize it by allowing expelled students to apply for readmission once. This one change would greatly increase the willingness of students and faculty to file charges, and it would decrease the sleaziness and lies that accused students routinely show at honor trials. We faculty all trade horror stories about the outrageous lies students tell when their necks are on the line. This is particularly a problem when African American students are accused. I know several faculty members who were accused of racism just for filing a case.

Students need to retake control of \*all\* aspects of the Honor System. This includes reporting dishonorable activities such as lying, cheating, and stealing. As it now stands, students know of these activities and ignore them or rely on faculty to report and expend the effort to bring cases to the Honor Committee. In the past, students who observed an honor offense and did not report it were also guilty of an honor offense. This provided significant motivation for students to report what they had seen or heard. This motivational tool should be reinstated if you expect the system to function as intended. After many discussions with other faculty who have collectively initiated many official honor investigations, it is clear that the current system is completely dysfunctional. The overwhelming sense that I get from them is that participation in the Honor System as it now stands is a complete waste of faculty time. I will ensure the integrity of my course by failing or lowering grades of students who cheat. However, I never agreed to serve as a member of an Honor police force, particularly given the system's denial of my critical role in the process and the administration's legal positioning that I am independent agent who can be sued by a disgruntled lying, cheating and/or stealing student. Why should I bear this burden for an all student run / controlled system? The burden and honor is yours, take it or leave it.

Multiple sanctions.

Punishment should always fit the crime. It makes absolutely no sense to dismiss someone from the University just because they copied some material from a friend for a test, which in the larger scheme of things in life is totally inconsequential. The strictest punishment should be failure on the assignment or course on which the student cheated. Anything more than that is plain ridiculous.

Should not be student run. Should not have single sanction.

Create multiple, graduated sanctions. Single sanction is a terrible idea. Expedite the trial process (often, years pass between the first contact with the Honor Committee and the trial).

Q: C5

I strongly believe a single sanction policy hinders students and faculty from actively enforcing the Honor Code.
To be impartial and effective, faculty oversight is imperative. Students are, frankly, too inexperienced to be dealing with such weighty issues. I am not sure the committee members fully appreciate the implications of university dismissal.
You should eliminate the single sanction and impose a gradation of penalties for the severity of the offense. The way it stands now it's like having the death penalty for capital murder, mugging, and jaywalking. Of course sensible juries are going to find sensible people innocent in these circumstances for the sole reason that they are aware of how far the punishment exceeds the crime.
Levels of punishment to fit the severity of the crime. A more expedited investigation and hearing system (takes too long as it is now).
I think there should be multiple sanctions. Students who plagiarize once should be given the chance to change and atone.
Allow for other penalties besides the single sanction. Some instances of cheating may warrant punishment, but expulsion is pretty extreme. The single sanction likely encourages more cheating because cheaters know that even if they get caught, if the offense seems trivial (looking at your notes on a ten point quiz or something like that), no student jury will ever convict a peer on such a charge (likely voting no on the seriousness clause) because the only punishment available (the single sanction) is too severe.
A multiple sanction system needs to be implemented.
Get rid of single sanction. More openness about investigations. Honor Committee seems more interested in glory than justice.
Do away with the single sanction.
Single-sanction is unreasonable.
I think it is fantastic to have an Honor System, but the single sanction is ridiculous - drop that and I would become an ardent rather than a reluctant supporter.
First, I believe that the Honor System needs to provide answers to the following: The number of students being found guilty and asked to leave the University, say, 30 years ago is more than three times the number in any recent year. This in spite of the fact that there are more students here now than there were back then. Are people three times more honest today than back then? A large majority of cases are brought by faculty and not by fellow students. What does this tell us? I have plenty of students confide to me that they know of many other students who are cheating. How can an Honor System be considered viable when the faculty has to do most of the policing? I need to see clear evidence that honor investigators and jury members have training in critical thinking and the use of evidence. When dealing with cases in math and science where numerical answers by students are being examined, some understanding of statistics and the probability of two numbers randomly coming out identical is critical. Jury members without such knowledge are not qualified to make judgments. In general, after 35 years of teaching, I am pretty convinced that the maturity of students is inadequate for the task. Too many have a worldview that people are basically nice and that everyone makes a mistake once and a while. This is not a realistic worldview. Unless a sufficient number of jury members have a basic belief that there are, in fact, bad people in the world who will cheat if they think they can get away with it, we will not make much progress with our honor situation. I think that my views are shared by many other faculty. Let's talk.
The single sanction should be replaced with options.
Remove the single sanction and provide for suspension up to two years.
Eliminate the single sanction. That ALONE, in my opinion, has created a system that is utterly ineffectual.
I don't believe in single sanction. I think there need to be levels of punishment based on the offense.
The easy answer would be to simply say that the single sanction needs to be abolished. In

<p>fact, however, UVa abolished the single sanction some years ago. UVa has two sanctions for cheating. Expulsion is meted out by the student Honor Committee for serious cheating and the faculty is expected to mete out grade lowering for 'non-serious cheating. UVa thus has neither a single sanction nor an entirely student-run system. I suggest that the Honor Committee take over all cheating, serious and non-serious, and develop a multiple sanction system like that at VCU. There also needs to be faculty input in deciding every honor case. I am aware of enough immature behavior on behalf of the Honor Committee members through the years to think that decisions of this importance should not be trusted entirely to students. Being on the Honor Committee should be a learning experience for the students involved, but now they are pooling ignorance rather than learning from persons with more life experience.</p>
<p>Students need real repercussions, and they cannot be trusted.</p>
<p>We need to get rid of the single sanction! It only discourages people from reporting infractions, and it makes the bar for convictions very high. Consequently, many students who may deserve some type of punishment get none. I am a proponent of Honor Codes; my college had one, and it worked well from what I could tell. The reason it worked was because it wasn't a single sanction (with initial sanctions ranging from academic / social probation to semester-long suspension). The other problem is that, because of the charges of racial bias in the Honor Code as it's presently enforced, people are worried about bringing cases against minority students even when there's overwhelming evidence of cheating. If we didn't have the single sanction to worry about, and the punishment was more appropriate and sensitive to the offense, I think the charges of racial bias would dissipate because there would be more reports of cheating across the board.</p>
<p>The faculty and administration should be responsible for a parallel system.</p>
<p>Abolish the single sanction.</p>
<p>Get rid of single sanction. As a faculty, why would I want to get someone kicked out of the university? I believe the punishment should fit the crime. Sure, kick our serial offenders. What happens now is that no one reports anyone and so the serial offenders stay in the system. I would use an Honor System with a different penalty structure. I didn't get to say this before but I have given someone a failing grade for an honor offense. I do not think that is sufficient. I was slightly horrified about the aspect of the Honor Committee that there is no institutional memory from case to case. They have to reinvent the wheel over and over again. I was told this was for privacy reasons but I don't see why students and faculty names can't just be redacted. In real trial situations precedent is terribly important.</p>
<p>The single sanction prevents me from ever wanting to engage with the Honor Committee about a possible offense, because some offenses do not seem like they should be punished by expelling the student. I'm also not interested in spending my valuable time as a graduate student in a length, annoying, arrogant process with self-important, conservative undergraduates ready to kick out one of their peers.</p>
<p>For minor offenses there should be less paperwork etc. and a lesser punishment. Too often there is no punishment because the existing punishment is too severe and not really fair since with good friends and good connections you get off. So it is more about popularity than honor.</p>
<p>The single sanction should be abolished.</p>
<p>Multiple sanctions might make it possible to use the system, but I will probably never give an unproctored exam in a giant lecture, unless I use multiple exams. I simply do not trust the students not to cheat. That has nothing to do with the Honor System. It has to do with them taking advantage of not getting caught. I would give unproctored exams to smaller classes, where I know the students.</p>
<p>Students who have clearly plagiarized should be severely punished in some way. From what I understand about the Honor System, most students are acquitted because of the single sanction. As an instructor, I would much rather fail a student for a paper or a course (depending on the severity of the offence). The System ought to be able to handle different levels of punishment (all serious) so that students actually take the consequences of their</p>

Q: C5

actions seriously, not assume that a good lawyer can get them off if they plead ignorance of what really constitutes plagiarism.

Students should not have such direct oversight, as those students who aspire to become part of the Honor System usually do so in order to wield authority or foster a sense of self-worth or acceptance rather than out of a genuine concern for honor. Therefore, the administration should supervise much more closely what cases proceed and how they proceed.

I don't think that it should be considered an honor violation for a faculty member, TA, or any member of the University community NOT to report an honor violation (this was part of the system at one point, no?). Especially if they object to it. Instructors should be trusted to judge the severity of an offense and choose a punishment they find appropriate (reduced grade, failure of assignment, failure of course, etc. No more single sanction. I might report a cheating student if I didn't think that they'd be thrown out of school. I think a lot of kids are actually avoiding punishment because instructors don't want to be responsible for a student's expulsion. Failing a class or a test is punishment enough. Because the punishment is so severe, the trials are lengthy and often have appeals, right? One of the first things I was told here, as a teaching assistant was never to turn a student in for an honor violation because it would take up all of my time, as well as that of the faculty member overseeing me. Again, the amount of time and energy an honor trial would take deters instructors from utilizing this option. Something about students sitting in judgment of one another rubs me the wrong way. I don't like the idea of some students building their resumes off of others' misfortunes or mistakes. I think that cheating and academic dishonesty are serious matters, but I don't like to see people simply thrown out of school for them. If I fail a student's paper for plagiarizing, I am punishing them (and being fair to their non-cheating colleagues), but also teaching them some sort of life lesson (I hope!). I wish Honor Committee members were able to extend similar concern to their fellow students. I think people make mistakes, and they should be given the opportunity to learn from them. This can't be under single sanction. If they learn their lesson (which is doubtful: they're thrown into a desperate situation that they try to lie their way out of), they don't have a chance to try again.

I think the recommendations of the College of Arts and Sciences should be adopted. There should be a forgiveness clause. Toleration of cheating should be a judicial violation. Students should publicize both honor convictions and rehabilitations.

Eliminate single sanction.

The one penalty for every infraction is ineffective. It discourages faculty from reporting honor offences and students from being honest when caught. I think it should be more like the criminal justice system and the punishment should be made to fit the crime.

Many alumni feel strongly that the Honor System formed their character. This is important. But we need to stress that honor is not a code of chivalry among white males, but a way to respect each other's work, differences and contributions. I'd call it something else, to signal a recognition of past associations and a new beginning.

Not student run or at least not entirely, not single sanction.

Remove the single sanction and formulate a graded punishment. With a sensible set of guidelines, the student jury could simultaneously decide guilt/innocence and the punishment, which could include expulsion. Any guilty outcome should appear on the student's transcript.

Abolish single sanction; go for two strikes on plagiarism, at least. Suspension or something for serious offenses,

Eliminate the single sanction. Convict students who are now be acquitted when there is clear evidence of cheating.

A two or three tier system of penalties is needed, including probation with stipulations of public service and mandatory ethics course requirements, probation with part of permanent record, and dismissal.

Of course students should have the right to bring charges against students who witnessed cheating. It is absurd in the extreme, however, to have the entire process run by students. Why would any reasonable person think even an intelligent, but by definition, inexperienced

Q: C5

and as yet uneducated person, is capable of making these decisions and prosecuting, defending, and adjudicating this quite weighty process in which hundreds of thousands of dollars in student loans and potentially millions of dollars in earning hang in the balance? Imagine you were required to defend yourself in a civil, or worse criminal, case where your defense attorney, your assigned prosecutor, and even your judge were all not only not yet college educated, but also not possibly on the job for more than two or three years! This process needs to be accurate to be just, and inexperience does not lend itself to accuracy. In such weighty matters with such far-reaching effects, mistakes are unjust and a procedure likely to make mistakes is necessarily comparatively unjust. On a related issue, the statistics regarding race have long been public. Minority students are much more likely to be accused, and more likely to be convicted. I simply fail to see any just reason for continuing the process as is, and would advocate the professionalization of the process. At least allow the accused the right to decent counsel. In what other procedural matters do we allow disputants to settle conflicts over hundreds of thousands of dollars and weighty matters sans attorneys?

**Q C6: Why do you think the system should be abolished? (Asked only of those who said the Honor System should be changed)**

I think that for students to sit in judgment on other students is elitist. The limited penalties make the system grossly unfair. The option of professors entrapping students as done in the past is immoral as is the ability to destroy the student's careers. Appeal process is a mockery and heavily loaded against the student.

Because students are not inclined to punish their peers with severe sanctions. Looking the other way, or finding innocence or the functional equivalent of it (not serious) are tacitly but widely encouraged.

Ineffectual. It is not fair to students who play by the rules that some students don't. I am finished trusting students with early exams.

Because the premises on which it rests - students' refusal to tolerate lying, cheating and stealing in their peers - no longer hold. The system can only work if faculty trust it. I no longer do.

The system doesn't work. The students have long since abdicated responsibility for the Honor System. An Honor Code without student responsibility is simply a system designed to allow students to cheat without punishment and without recourse for the faculty. In order for an Honor Code to be successful one must be obligated to not tolerate cheating. In other words, if a student sees another student cheat he/she must turn in the cheater or be expelled themselves. The only schools with functioning Honor Codes in this country (VIM, W and L, Davidson for example) have non-toleration clauses. This is what is meant by a community of trust. A community of trust is not a system where students turn other students in only when they feel like (i.e. almost never).

Being a recent college grad myself, I find it unbelievable that a student body can actually govern itself fairly on such a nontrivial matter. Cheating is accepted by students in many forms, so students would certainly be reluctant to inflict such strict consequences on a peer who has done something that they would consider only morally questionable, if not excusable.

Without genuine support from students, the Honor Code is meaningless. I don't think students really care.

Single sanction is a relic from bygone days of gentlemanly conduct. By holding to its ideal, it romanticizes the challenges of thousands of individual students at a public university into a single code. Its biggest problem is its heavy responsibility: burdened with throwing students out of school, the Honor System does not receive all reports of cheating from teachers who are sympathetic to the students or unsure; dismisses a large number of cases actually brought to their notice, \*without\* other disciplinary recourse. Likewise, the Honor System has created a culture of suspicion particularly among racial minorities who perceive bias in

Q: E1

<p>its decisions. Finally, it places an impossible burden on the instructor, as accused students place undue amounts of responsibility for the Honor System's draconian threats on faculty and TAs. Simply put, this university needs a more realistic, flexible, considerate and effective disciplinary structure.</p>
<p>It grew out of the slave South's notion of honor. No one at UVa is willing to grapple with that fact. Not to mention that students are really not capable of making these decisions, at least as far as classroom work goes.</p>
<p>It is a self-fulfilling prophecy, but also a false one. It actually does not work, yet students coming from this university can claim it is in existence, and therefore they are somehow more trustworthy and clean than other students coming from universities without Honor Codes.</p>
<p>I do not believe students should sit in judgment of other students. I think it is unwise in terms of the burden it places on students and unnecessary to the university community. Lying and cheating can be handled directly by the faculty responsible for grading or other parties affected. Depending upon its seriousness, stealing can be handled by either by the university administration and / or the police. I don't think we need our own little court system. Furthermore, knowing what we do about the complexity of human behavior. I cannot understand why we keep the simpleminded idea of honor in a place of primacy when we think about causality, deterrence, or punishment. It makes a mockery of the body of knowledge contained in what we teach in departments such as psychology, sociology, and psychiatry. It eliminates the potential to intervene in a corrective way without destroying academic careers. It should be called the "dishonor" System because that is what it does to everyone at the university each time it is invoked. I would favor abolishing this primitive aspect of the Cavalier image.</p>
<p>It should go without saying that a student at UVa or any other similar institution should be expected to behave morally without an elaborate system and a single sanction for violation. It is part of what infantilizes young men and women who should be here to improve themselves and grow as citizens and human beings.</p>
<p>It is based on an outdated and flawed notion of honor, which is both masculine and military in origin. I do not believe undergraduates have the maturity to judge their fellow students and I believe such a system is likely to unduly punish minority students and foreign students. I believe the single sanction system is overly simplistic and a blunt tool for nuanced cases. I do not understand why cheating should be considered a violation of 'honor' while underage drinking or date rape is not. The system as stated discourages collaboration or makes all collaboration suspect which is counter to good principles of learning. The notion of the Honor System encourages a self-righteous sense of moral superiority when it is unjustified.</p>
<p>Every bit of evidence we have suggests the Honor Code is enforced unevenly and unfairly, with a highly disproportional number of blacks and other disadvantaged students suffering as a result. We continue to see that the university has a systemic problem of racism that it refuses to fully acknowledge and address. I have no trust in a code that constitutes an integral part of that problem, and is indeed rooted in a history of Southern elitism. As such, I conscientiously refuse to participate in any aspect of the system. I take cheating and academic dishonesty very seriously in my classes and assume that students brought up in a competitive educational system such as ours do too. I deal with suspicious or inappropriate academic performance as I see fit, on a case-by-case basis. As for other forms of unlawful or questionable activity, I see no reason why our state and local law enforcement agencies do not suffice. Under the social circumstances we find at the university, I do not believe any reformation of the Honor Code could possibly rectify it; no doubt whatever new shape it may (or may not) take will continue to benefit those powerful and privileged enough to manipulate it. I thank you for inviting me to participate in this survey.</p>
<p>I disagree with several things. First, I hate the single sanction policy. Second, the process is bulky to the point of being ineffectual. It is so bulky, in fact, that I've been specifically asked by faculty to NOT monitor for cheating during tests because the faculty doesn't want to spend the next several months in the Honors process. It thus renders the authority of faculty to guard against cheating ineffectual.</p>



Q: E1

It reinforces precisely the behavior it sets out to reprimand.
As stated previously, a single sanction system administered through secret trials conducted by immature and perhaps racist students that results in selective targeting of minorities is a matter of shame and not honor.
I simply fail to understand why students should be involved in the process.
It presumes guilt. What moron needs an institution to know that cheating is wrong? Moreover, how does signing a pledge stop a liar from cheating? It only casts suspicion on those who are honest and, perhaps, gives the impression that 'honor' is somehow superogative.
It's the occasion of sin, as the scholastic philosophers say. It tempts students to cheat.
I don't think it is doing a good job. I don't think it should be only students who make judgments. Students do not have the experience or compassion that is needed for such a role. I think the punishment (suspension) is too harsh.
I expect students to deal with me and others truthfully, not only at times when they are specifically instructed to do so. If they are not truthful or commit plagiarism, their punishment should be at my discretion.
Course instructors rather than a student panel should decide what to do when students cheat (e.g., grade penalty or report the case to higher authorities). It would be hard to change this student-driven system. It's easier to abolish it.
I have had some international friends and they would tell me how easy it was to cheat at UVa and that exams wouldn't even be proctored. I think the system invites students to cheat, especially those, for whom not cheating has not been a strong norm in their previous academic experience. Single sanction compounds the problem since it leads to toleration of minor violations of the code.
Some students obviously do not take the system fairly, which means that those who do are at a disadvantage, as TAs and faculty cannot accuse students suspected of cheating of being dishonest.
From seeing other TA's and professors try to use the system, it seems completely counterproductive. Not only is it practically impossible to prove cheating, even in instances when it seemed clear, it seems wrong that the system is geared toward a single sanction. I think that there should be serious penalties for cheating, but I don't think that it should be all or nothing. As an educational institution, we should direct ourselves toward educating students toward using sources correctly and creating scaffold assignments in which it is impossible for students to cheat.
It's biased. It's completely impractical. It has no basis in the reality of student life.
A hypocritical standard never enforced and not respected by students, it makes a mockery of UVa's sense of dignity.
It does not work.
It is unfair for a student to be judged to that degree by other students without adult supervision. It is unfair for students to fail the course and then have a professor bring them up on an honors offense. I feel the process is discriminatory.
The single sanction system is absolutely horrendous and discriminatory.
It is an anachronism. It is enforced in a haphazard, random manner which makes it inherently unfair.
It exists on paper and in name only, not by the demonstrated actions of the undergraduates. I do not care whether or not a student says they will be honest; I want them to focus on actually being honest -- my observations are based not on my own classes, which are more project-than-test-oriented, but on student discussion and faculty senate presentations.
My feelings address only the aspect of the system that deals with classroom conduct: in that context, though, I feel that trust is an issue between teacher and student, not student and student.
It's neither an effective nor a fair way of enforcing the rules. In addition, the single sanction is absurd.

Q: E1

**Q D6 Other: When you have a question or concern about the Honor System, where / who do you turn to?**

No one, anymore. After serious efforts to use the 'system' (so-called), I have become convinced there is no point in trying anymore.
Faculty Handbook.
Jesus Christ.
Multiple sources.
It depends on the question.
I have never had questions.
I would turn to several of these to answer a question. This question is not well written.
Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs.
I haven't had occasion to ask questions for years now.
Chair or Dean's office.
Nobody. I want nothing further to do with it, so I don't need any questions answered.
Other TAs.
I have never had a question.
Depends on the question or concern.
I basically ignore it
No one, I don't have questions or concerns about the Honor System.
Several of those; in fact all of them except honor support officer - I don't know that term.
I talk to the V-Provost.
Honor advisor handbook.
The Richmond Center staff.
Never had a question.
It's not worth anyone's time to have questions about the Honor System.
I'd select several of the above.
Don't know - don't EVER see an undergraduate except crossing the street. Only occasionally see senior medical students and only on clinical rotations.

**Q E1 Other: The Honor Committee wants to improve its communication with faculty members. Which of the following methods of communication would you most prefer?**

Why the faculty? We are not your police if the students in class do not enforce the code why should we?
Public burning of the fraternity and sorority paper files would do wonders for faculty support. The "How Things Work" cheating cases were clearly based on file sharing. Has the Honor Committee tried pressuring the Greeks to get rid of these files in all forms - paper and electronic?
Get in touch after there has been serious reform. No point in doing so before then.
Change the single sanction policy. Until faculty members believe the Honor Committee has reasonable ways of dealing with offenses, many of us will prefer to handle things ourselves rather than deal with a process that has only two possible outcomes, both of which are unsatisfactory in most cases.
Actually listening to the faculty disgust with the Honor System instead of, year after year, having an Honor Committee that promises to fix the system and never does.
Why bother? The students and alumni are committed to maintaining a sham. In a certain sense, it could be considered an honor offense to support the Honor System, because the

Q: E1

system itself is based on a lie.
Rather than a group presentation, how about a group discussion. The faculty knows about the Honor System. But they definitely do not feel like they are a part of it.
Not interested.
When I arrived at UVa in 1992, I was given an excellent concise brochure describing the Honor System. When I reported a case in 1993, the honor reps I met had never seen the brochure. That brochure is not among the choices to this question.
Newsletters in my mailbox.
Forgetting it. I've too many more important things to do, one of which might be helping students who think they have to cheat.
Orientation for new faculty including medical school.
Change the system so that it is effective and not such a time sink. I'll never use it again after more than one bad experience.
Enlist support of DUPs and communicate through them. (I'm a DUP.)
This question seems reformist and gradualist rather than facing up to the basic problems with the system. I would gladly work with students who have reformed their system, but I'd be reluctant to devote class time or my time to promulgation of information about the current, broken system.
This is a ruse. The Honor Committee only wants the appearance on an Honor System, not the reality of one. Until this situation changes, I have no interest in wasting time on it.
I really don't want more communication. I and my colleagues are convinced the present system does not work very well - and that it is particularly costly to faculty. So why do I want to talk about that?
Would it be possible to train faculty members to act as a liaison between the faculty and the Honor System? Faculty are much more likely to contact other faculty than to contact the Honor Committee with a question or concern.
None of these solutions really addresses the needed form of communication. In other words, these all suggest the Honor Committee needs to better communicate to the faculty and teaching assistants. In reality, the Honor Committee needs to better listen to teaching staff and faculty. It does too much talking at us and not nearly enough communicating - something that is essentially mutual in nature.
Do not ask for any of my time unless systematic reform is undertaken. .
I see no need for communication until the system is changed.
After abolition, there would be no need to communicate.
Actually, I feel that I have enough information from the Honor Committee. I don't want more communication. I want some changes in the system.
I'm frankly getting tired of this. The Honor System is essential to the University; you need to know much more about it.
If student support was sufficient to make the system work, there'd be no problem with the faculty. What we lack is not pep talks or information.
Open brainstorming workshops at which faculty concerns will be genuinely heard, and possible solutions for the problems aired. As long as improved communication from the Honor Committee means only that honor representatives will tell faculty how to behave, without also listening seriously to our point of view, it will be ineffective.
I don't think communication is a problem.
I seek no communication but reform.
I personally think we need a better and quite different system. We don't need training by - or additional communications from - unqualified people who are running a very faulty system.
For new faculty, some kind of session or booth / display, perhaps at the TRC's workshop at the start of fall term.
Honor Committee could produce some sort of written material periodically, with the intension of engaging the faculty and over time acquainting them more thoroughly with the Honor

Q: E1

System.
Stop bothering us. Many of us think the system has become a joke, and we would never consider initiating a case. So we don't want to spend any more time listening to noble appeals to support a dying system. Change the system; change the single sanction, and perhaps faculty interest will improve.
Improve the system so that it seems more attractive to the faculty.
To be available when required (if and when that is possible).
Brochures.
As a graduate instructor my only information about the Honor System was the brief presentation made during my orientation as a doctoral student and the information session I attended when I considered getting involved in honor.
Already available - someone to take questions via email and phone.
None. The Honor Committee doesn't need to improve communication with the faculty. It needs to actually make a decision regarding its plan of action. No one seems to be able to do that amidst the political posturing I read about in the school newspaper.
When the Honor System changes, more faculty may be interested in cooperating with it.
I feel like there are adequate *methods* of communication; the problem is that the *content* of what there is to communicate is inadequate to faculty concerns over cheating, plagiarism, and so on, and does not represent an approach that actually helps faculty as we address these problems and seek to promote a constructive, ethical learning environment for ourselves and our students.
The Honor Committee is not the problem. I admire and support their efforts to preserve standards of honorable conduct in a hostile and cynical environment.
I am so disgusted with the whole thing that I have no interest in it at all. Don't bother me with it.
Abolish the Honor System now!
Make Honor Code materials and training available similarly as library orientation, to teaching assistants. More importantly, offer models of how to use the Honor Code in teaching (what's the deal with the pledges, for example?). This kind of training would best come from peers - other TAs who use the Honor Code in this or that way. The problem with getting training from program administrators is that it's often too general and we TAs observe things happening differently in our departments in practice.
All of the stuff above sounds like Honor telling things to faculty. I think you need to figure out a better way of listening to faculty. Most faculty have a pretty good idea of what is required of them concerning Honor, but have very little way of demonstrating to Honor the actual state of how the process works on a day to day basis for a faculty member. I would recommend that Honor support officers and Honor Committee members actually sit in on classes or have some sort of format whereby you can get accurate information on why faculty do and do not report cases, as well as information from faculty on how many possible Honor violations go unreported.
In my classes, I don't have tests or work of the sort the Honor Code covers. If I do in the future, I would visit the web site to get the most current information.
For my case it's difficult because I'm not just a TA but also have my research and my classes etc. The responsible professor has to be involved to get all the TAs in one boat.
Faculty members will typically seek information regarding the UVa Honor System when s/he needs to report a case. Website is the first mode of data mining - calling a representative is next. I don't think workshops etc. will have good attendance.
The most useful thing the Honor Committee ever did for faculty was publish and distribute a booklet entitled "Academic Fraud". But it hasn't been reissued for years. Republish that, give it to every entering student, and give faculty multiple copies to refer to and hand out.
I think the current system is inherently flawed, and that training sessions will not improve the fact that such a system depends on compliance from everyone involved. It is incredibly naive to assume at all students will adhere to a voluntary system. There will always be those

Q: E1

who cheat knowingly and perhaps unintentionally.
The Honor Committee needs to talk directly with faculty about the system because many faculty believe that changes might be warranted.
Faculty members tend to want a multiplicity of interactions. I'd suggest a combination of all of the above.
Abolition of Honor Committee.
The faculty communication is not the problem. If the Honor System is to work, the students must believe in it.
Intermittent brief reminders by email.
Commission and independent investigation of how the system is and is not working and present results to faculty meetings.
Any method that doesn't require faculty members or TAs to give up too much of their time (which is a valuable commodity in academia).
Reform of the system. Adoption of either a forgiveness clause or elimination of the single sanction.
Until the single sanction system is changed, I don't really want to know more about the Honor System. Only when I detect a case of infringement that I myself deem should result in expulsion (which would be rare in the case of lying or cheating, less so if it was stealing), will I then involve the Honor Committee. In all other circumstances I will search for an alternative approached to addressing the infringement.
Eliminate the single sanction; develop a system that the faculty can endorse and be comfortable with.
Don't care, whatever works best for your system as a whole.

**Q E2: In your opinion, what are the factors that work to reduce the effectiveness of the Honor System at UVA?**

Not knowing the procedures to take when a violation has been observed.
In general SOME faculty do not seem as aware as many of us don't teach in traditional class room settings.
I think the Honor System is remarkably effective.
Uneven enforcement. Student ethical customs.
Uninformed faculty, students who don't feel strongly about Honor System.
Failure to deal with offenses in a timely manner. Faculty simply don't want prolonged / protracted times to resolution.
Lack of clarity to role in medical school and post-graduate medical education.
Student and faculty support.
The status of moral behavior in society in general today, which spills over into the students who attend the University.
Cynicism.
Lack of faith in students' ability to police themselves and hold peers accountable for honesty and integrity.
Strict penalties.
Enforcement.
In graduate level courses, with primarily essay style exams, the issue is usually suspected plagiarism. This is much more difficult to detect.
Student and faculty fears that the system is not uniformly applied. Student and faculty confusion about reprehensibility.
The school is now so large and impersonal the students do not think of themselves as a single community, they have fractured in many ways.

Attitudes towards cheating: Since many assignments require students to work together, students feel that working together, even when not allowed, is not morally wrong. Cheating on a homework assignment is often not considered serious enough for expulsion.
Single sanction and black-and-white nature of judgment.
Single sanction = limited options.
Not mindfulness or non-awareness.
Student tolerance of certain types of cheating which they do not see as serious enough to warrant the single sanction. In other words, the single sanction is probably the single most decisive factor in the almost universal student and faculty reluctance to report cases. What we see on students' part is basically nullification of the Honor System.
Process is so involved that I wouldn't report an honor offense unless it was something really terrible and I was absolutely certain the student did it.
Inconsistent support from within the faculty and administration.
Single sanction. Student fascination with 'tradition' that prevents actually making a serious system based on serious ideas about honor.
I teach medical students in their clinical courses and residents in the hospital and our need for the Honor Code is much less than what would be needed in the rest of the school.
Length of time it takes. Faculty involvement.
Single sanction.
While the Honor System is ostensibly run by and for students, it seems to rely entirely on faculty to report infractions. For a faculty member inundated with responsibilities, the extensive judicial process is not an appealing option.
The fact that teachers feel they can't get a conviction (not expulsion) for minor offences. And I personally am still confused about what I'm supposed to do if a student cheats.
The single sanction. The accusation of spotlighting.
The fact that many faculty do not use it at all, preferring instead to deal with cheating on their own, or within the department. Also, the knowledge that almost no students are actually found guilty within the Honor Code, despite substantial evidence for cheating, because the Honor Committee is reluctant to apply the single sanction to all but the worst cases.
Single sanction.
Hypocrisy.
Hidebound tradition and single sanction.
Faculty reluctance to bring charges.
If students are hesitant to acknowledge honor infractions or judge their peers harshly, even if deserved.
I think involving students is a laudable goal. But there should be a professional staff that handles academic violations. This would allow for continuity, but also would help to restore a measure of professionalism to the system. Additionally, the single sanction is, in my opinion, wholly inappropriate for most honor violations. Suspension, with an indication on the record, plus community service would often seem to be a better sentence.
An all or nothing system does not allow for reconciliation, negotiation or mediations and likely pushes offenses underground as there are certainly times when either faculty or students may suspect an Honor Code violation, and would like to address it, but with a culture of absolutes with dismissal as the only option, the offense may go completely underground.
The combination of the single sanction and the seriousness clause.
Students not reporting incidents of cheating/lying that they witness. The honor process is quite slow and time-consuming. In many cases when cheating did occur, the student is acquitted. When this happens so frequently, faculty start to believe they are better off dealing with the problem on their own.
I was not aware that the UVa Honor System is not effective.
Single sanction, emphasis on 'tradition at UVa even at the cost of making needed reforms. Failure to recognize that a symbolically strong system can be a weak one in practice. Failure

to think about the incentives the current system creates for students and faculty. Lack of quiet leadership by the administration, even if decisions must ultimately rest in the hands of the students.
Single sanction inefficiency of the Honor Committee.
Time consuming process, perception that due diligence is not performed.
Single sanction students' unwillingness to turn each other in self-congratulatory nature of the Honor Committee.
Lack of student support. Attitudes of honor insiders.
Lack of participation.
Single sanction.
Instructors don't want to take the time necessary to initiate proceedings. Additionally, the single sanction seems too harsh in many cases.
The fact that it is student run.
The single sanction is the main issue. But also the fact that a student can rape and yet be considered honorable is a scandal.
Less talk, more action!
I thought it was working fine. Is it not?
It is totally independent of other types of administrative proceedings, and thus it can seem arbitrary, with fewer protections for the accused than other types of proceedings.
The single sanction.
Inadequate information.
The requirement that students report other students' violations undermines the system because it strikes many as informing or squealing. Yet the requirement is right nonetheless.
People don't report offenses.
Students are reluctant to report each other and faculty are reluctant to report for fear it's a waste of time.
University size. Changing moral values.
The fact that professors at UVa are generally researchers, not teachers.
The single sanction clearly is the greatest problem. Last semester, two students were found guilty of cheating, but nothing was done to them because the cheating wasn't serious enough. This cheapens the system and asks for ridicule.
The single sanction and the seriousness clause. The recent open honor trial that found the accused students guilty of knowingly cheating but also found that the particular instance of cheating was not serious enough to warrant dismissal. As a faculty member, by what metric do I determine if assignments I give are important enough to fall under the Honor Code, which has a single sanction? The message I took from reporting of the trial and verdict is that it is OK to cheat on small assignments.
People don't want to be responsible for a student's dismissal. The Honor System is bureaucratic and honor accusations take a lot of time and energy.
Single sanction, combined with students' tendency to view expulsion as too severe except when offense is very serious and proof is ironclad.
Single sanction and the permissiveness it fosters.
Lack of support by some faculty and students. Lack of understanding by some faculty and students.
Other offenses should be included. I have the sense that some students don't understand what plagiarism involves and that their views about the import of plagiarism and cheating have become looser in recent years.
Low student reporting due to single sanction. Low faculty participation due to single sanction (or other moral differences with reporting students) or sometimes just because it is too much hassle.
Impression that it doesn't work or that too many guilty students are found innocent.

The lack of clearly defined punishments and the rampant cheating allowed in Virginia high schools.
I've heard tales from other faculty of not reporting incidences out of concern that the penalty was too harsh. This would seem to clearly undermine the system. In addition, within weeks of arriving at UVa (two years ago), I began hearing stories about incidences that were reported which resulted in decisions that the faculty deemed unsatisfactory (generally when pretty clear evidence was at hand, but no real penalty was enacted). The explanations given to me included overly legalistic reasoning regarding what should be widely understood norms and hesitation on the part of students to pull the trigger. Thus, I gathered there was relatively wide dissatisfaction with the system on the part of my departmental colleagues for a variety of reasons.
Failure to compel students to report violations.
Many do not support the single sanction, and so are reluctant to report offences.
Lack of trust among students and faculty.
The single sanction. Student reluctance to report cases they observe. The retraction of the Non-Toleration Clause (big mistake). The unwillingness to return the Non-Toleration Clause. The Honor Committee's unwillingness to embrace change.
Lack of faculty cooperation.
Lack of faculty support.
The amount of time it takes from the instructor busy life. The fact that student's will not report a violation.
Failure to remove students who are clearly guilty.
Lack of students taking responsibility themselves for turning in fellow students, process is too drawn out, single sanction makes students reluctant to find guilty even when obvious misbehavior is evident.
Time it takes from violation to hearing. Clear advocacy for both accuser (stressful for faculty) and accused (student). Rigidity of sanction.
Single sanction, trial process that puts burden on professors / instructors.
The fact that it seems that only major offenses are serious enough to bring to the Honor Committee and there is very little recourse for smaller infractions.
The single sanction and the fact that faculty members have no power in honor trials.
Not all faculty support the Honor System.
Single sanction.
Internet - student ignorance about plagiarism role of students in reporting violations single sanction hassle of trials.
I know many people do not like the single sanction system, and fear reporting because it can take so much of a faculty member's time.
Lack of faculty support.
I am an Associate professor of pediatrics and therefore have very little involvement with the Honor System. I don't have any suggestions as a result.
The students are not encouraged enough to participate in the system. No students want to rat out their friends, and because of that the system cannot adequately work. They should be more strongly encouraged by the faculty to actively participate in and enforce the Honor Code themselves.
Lack of consistency.
Poor communication between the Honor System representatives and the faculty. We only heard about it once, at the big TA meeting at the beginning of our work here. Yet when you start working and encounter real-life situations, you want to ask some specific questions. It would be good to have a phone help-line or be able to schedule one-on-one interactions with the Honor people. The entire communication process should be made very easy.
Stiffness of penalty if convicted I feel as though a handful of students don't take it seriously and instructors don't want to be responsible for expulsion of a student if it is a minor



infraction or first time offense.
Penalty is insensitive to differences between cases and offenses - some are much worse than others. Having only one punishment (or limited punishment) makes students reluctant to impose the guilty verdict.
Single sanction.
The very long time it takes to process cases. The perception that because such a small percentage of cheating actually goes to the honor community, a person who is willing to spend the time pressing charges may well have some bias against the alleged cheater. After all only the Honor Committee gets to put this on their resume.
I suppose just people not being totally informed about how it works. I myself may actually have answered some of the questions on this survey incorrectly as it is not really something I have had to be overly familiar with since I have never suspected a student of cheating.
Single sanction - although I think that certain situations should involve expulsion, I do not think all cases warrant this. I also think that students, TAs, and faculty do not report many instances of suspected cheating due to the single sanction.
Support from faculty. Enthusiasm from students.
Single sanction is likely to promote faculty who disagree with it to use his or her own procedures to deal with the problem. Selectivity: honor needs to be regarded more holistically. To say it's not okay to lie, but it's okay if you're in a frat to haze and behave in a way that's aggressive and disrespectful to the community three nights per week does not reflect well on the principle.
Students' refusal to judge others, expressed in jury nullification. Students' perception that the seriousness of cheating depends on the percentage of the grade involved.
Single sanction for all cases.
The students do not take responsibility for the Honor Code.
Students seem unwilling to accuse each other of honor offenses. Students are reluctant to expel other students for what they consider to be minor forms of cheating.
Single sanction and lack of faculty input on the level of punishment.
The single sanction and the fact that many right-thinking faculty are not willing to expose students to such a drastic penalty for what may be an offense that does not, in the faculty member's opinion, justify that sort of sanction.
Having it.
It simply is not working to rid the student body of dishonest people. If the student body and administration (including the Board) are willing to accept that only about 75% of the student body is truly honest, then fine, don't make any changes. But then let's also reduce the overblown rhetoric surrounding the system.
President Bush. Political process, Republicans in particular. Girlfriend / boyfriends who lie and cheat yet prosper on good looks and charm! Media exposure of the benefits of cheating and the rarity of punishment. But really: lack of exposure to mentors who extol the benefits of honorable behavior and reputation.
All-or-nothing punishment scheme. Being decided by students.
It is not very well known.
Single sanction.
Non-uniform enforcement.
Students who are afraid to be honorable.
Single penalty, culture of moral relativism which holds nobody responsible for their actions.
Lack of support for single sanction means that some offenses might not be reported by those who believe that the punishment would be too harsh. With a greater shading of punishments to fit various degrees of Honor Code breaking behavior, it is likely more offenses would be reported.
Lack of information that is communicated to us or the mechanism by which we obtain this information.

Q: E2

Single sanction.
A deteriorating culture that no longer 'honors' honesty. Students who won't fulfill their responsibilities to the system. Faculty who won't fulfill their responsibilities to the system. An administration that is too politically correct to stand up and support strongly the system, as it should, requiring faculty to enforce the system, for example.
There is a perception that students do not want to find one of their peers guilty of an honor offense and have them expelled from the university.
By reducing honor to a set of rules, students are encouraged to abandon any intrinsic sense of what is honorable and, instead, walk the edge of the rules: behavior which can only be described as dishonorable. Further, the single sanction makes most honor offenses not sufficiently serious to warrant action.
Allowing trivial offences, allowing outside paid attorneys.
That it is only student run and there are no options other than dismissal. However, this means that honor is held in the highest regard, and I truly respect that.
I think that it's already effective.
Doubts about fairness, recourse to outside professional lawyers for students charged.
Shades of violation.
Faculty and students avoiding use of the Honor System to save them the hassle.
The faculty must not blindly believe the Honor System is perfect. Must minimize opportunities for students to copy, cheat, etc.
Rumors of how much trouble / time it takes to get through an honor hearing. Stories of how the faculty was criticized for reporting.
The single sanction undermines effectiveness.
Most of the faculty that I have personally observed dealing with cheating think of the Honor System as the last resort. They prefer to confront the student directly and try to get to the bottom of what motivated the student's action. Very often, cheating is a last minute, panic strategy by a student who's in serious difficulty (personal or academic). In such cases, most of us feel that a reprimand-type penalty (F on the assignment) coupled with a lot of support and personal guidance is by far the better choice (from an educational point of view). I have also heard many faculty say that they would prefer not to get dragged into an adversarial, time-consuming honor case in which they will be personally attacked and a student who is guilty as hell might escape conviction.
It is no longer a completely student run system. When I was a student, it was an honor offense not to report an honor offense. That is no longer true. When I was a student, only students could bring an honor violation forward; that is no longer true. The fact that faculty are now involved in bringing honor charges has, in my opinion, greatly reduced the effectiveness of the system. I think students have now placed the burden onto the faculty and are less likely to report a suspected offense.
The main obstacle is lack of student support. Indeed, I think most students like the Honor System because of the lack of faculty scrutiny it engenders. Not all, but many, students rely on the Honor System to facilitate cheating. They know that faculty and students alike are unwilling to tangle with the system (even when they are positive about cheating). Peer pressure and the single sanction are insurmountable obstacles.
I am new and do not have the experience to answer.
Jaded faculty. Perceived inconsistent application.
Students are too lenient. Reporting cases is too time-consuming. Too hard to prove cheating when it is obvious to the instructor.
Single sanction greatly inhibits faculty buy-in. Faculty perceives that juries find an excuse to let students off. Separation of verdict and penalty will help (I think I saw that change recently).
Faculty and TA ignorance of the Honor System and failure to take it seriously.
The single sanction - it is harsh and unrealistic.

Complexity, uncertainty and obscurity of the process. One gains the impression that in most cases little of consequence happens.
There should be a clear and mutual understanding (maybe even belief) that cheating is unacceptable. Furthermore, the definition of cheating seems not settled among the students. For example, it's OK to cut and paste some work found over the internet because they found it by researching it. This example is the best one to describe how some students rationalize their almost-too-close cheating behavior.
The force of the peculiar culture that posits this idea of tradition, which is reinforced by powerful and punitive social norms that function significantly through the fraternity and alumni systems. The desire for the Virginia system is stronger than the desire for a fair and honest system. Virginia's system trains students to see how much they can get away with while preserving the illusion of good behavior.
Lack of effort in implementation and follow through by faculty / teachers.
Lack of student reporting of offenses.
Lack of understanding. Lack of faculty support.
Single sanction, single sanction, single sanction! Out of touch committee members.
Degrees of guilt, seriousness, etc. plus the single sanction.
Failure to bring charges.
Students are unwilling to find other students at fault. Since no one wants to be punished, they are unlikely to punish others.
Students primarily depend on faculty / grad students to bring forward charges (>85%). Faculty do not support the System because of the single sanction. So the current system is dysfunctional. When faculty do bring cases, they are attacked by want to-be student lawyers who watched too many episodes of Law and Order. At present, only a small fraction of real cases are brought forward, but this is enough to provide the pretense of a working Honor System and to placate alums (and BOV members) who believe this charade is a cornerstone of the University.
Single sanction. Refusal to report on behalf of faculty.
Single-sanction is generally regarded as unsubtle and draconian. The result is that guilty students are sometimes not convicted, a form of jury nullification.
Considering the seriousness of an honor offense. If a person was found guilty on act and intent, then they obviously seriously committed the crime. However, I do agree that not all forms of lying, stealing, or cheating warrant expulsion. Also, having an entirely student run Honor System (which I know UVA is proud of) makes it a joke to the faculty. Student run organizations, by their nature, are poorly run and inconsistent. If you want the faculty to believe in the system, let them participate. Or better yet, the administration.
The system is too heavily weighted towards the rights of the accused students and not the maintenance of a community of trust. The onus should be on the accused student.
Students have too little responsibility in the reporting stage, and faculty have too little voice once a proceeding is under way (in one case, a colleague attempted to retract an accusation after it became clear that the student had not intentionally cheated, and the student was subjected to a trial anyway. The perception among faculty members to whom I have spoken is that the process is arbitrary.
The single sanction as its only disciplinary option. This decreases the likelihood that cases will be reported OR followed through by the Honor Committee. Second, the complicated procedures that result from the single sanction, which seem inflexible considering the needs and disciplinary imagination of the students and faculty involved.
Lack of trust in the system.
Sadly, I think sometimes faculty are too busy to consider entangling themselves in an honor charge. They probably also are not fully knowledgeable of the processes, policies, etc.
Single sanction.
The expulsion upon conviction policy. The accusations that minority students are accused disproportionately more often.

Single sanction, unwillingness of students to find each other guilty, incredible time commitment on faculty.
Harsh penalties make instructors hesitant to report offenses. Lacks of reports make students lose respect for it.
The difficulty (for all involved) in applying the single sanction. The newfound ease of cheating in the digital age. UVa's deceptive approach to ESL students: admitting students who really lack the skills to do well here, but not giving them real remedial training - so they feel compelled to cheat.
Not enforcing a strong policy.
Insufficient publicity regarding details of convictions.
Work required to file a case. The low conviction rate.
I think that many faculty, specifically on the health system side have many other responsibilities that compete for the time and effort involved in honor violations
The single sanction is a problem. Many faculty are unwilling to bring honor charges against a student unless they feel the cheating was egregious.
If it is not universally supported by teachers it may undermine how seriously some students take the Honor System.
Aside from my previous answer about how it treats student work as private intellectual property, rather than supporting the idea of an intellectual community, the Honor System, like all other institutions at this university must deal with effects of racism, while I have not experienced any trials, the word on the street is that the system disproportionately prosecutes students of color.
One-on-one discussion between new faculty and their department chair as to how the system works, how to implement it, etc.
Lack of support by students and faculty.
Lack of knowledge of function at graduate level.
Faculty not taking action against cheating. Failure on part of Honor Committee to act when cheating is obvious (bar is too high for conviction because penalty is so extreme).
People who don't report infractions and lack of familiarity with the process.
Single sanction. Lack of willingness of students to charge a classmate. Drop the seriousness clause.
Single sanction prevents many faculty from filing charges. Seriousness needs to be clarified for student juries.
I didn't know it wasn't effective.
The threat of the single sanction.
The system itself. The students should be grown up enough to decide for themselves that they do not steal, cheat or lie. They don't need an Honor Code for that.
Single sanction. There are other factors, such as the level of evidence required to bring a case to trial and, of course, the much discussed issue of racial bias.
Technology.
Many faculty come here from other schools with far different policies. They are used to handling these kinds of problems on their own.
No uniform enforcement-some faculty don't believe in the system and are unwilling to abide by it.
Single sanction.
The difficulty of detection. Faculty who do not update courses.
The absence of a tolerance clause requiring students to report honor offenses.
Lack of clear information on faculty options.
Single sanction.
Some community members have a lack of commitment to the Honor System.
Lack of knowledge among faculty and students.

Q: E2

Less propagating.
The single sanction.
The System is not as effective as it might be because not all students and faculty believe in it.
Not known as well in the Medical Center.
I think faculty members are reluctant to initiate cases and opt to deal with many cheating situations themselves.
Weight of sanction prevents students who are guilty from being found guilty. Additionally, it seems that a structural bias toward the wealthy and well-connected students exists in that cases not being seen as posing a threat to the community of trust (drinking at fraternity /sorority parties, use of fake IDs, sexual assault where evidence for tiered sanction but not single sanction obtains, and other IFC/SC offenses).
Lack of understanding the system and concerns regarding legal liabilities for the faculty and committee members.
Single sanction lack of discussion about the nuances of the Honor System so faculty can better learn how to set expectations and manage the process.
Single sanctions and unsupervised exams.
No requirement for students to report on their peer's single sanction.
Unwillingness of students to impose a single sanction, resulting in too many not guilty verdicts.
Faculty are suspicious of the system, in my experience.
Unwillingness of students to report violations politicization of the process.
A significant lack of understanding of how the Honor System works.
Lack of clarity about the Honor System.
Lengthy and adversarial to faculty.
I feel the single sanction for the first offense is the main factor working against the system's effectiveness.
Single sanction. Disproportionate number of minorities accused of cheating.
Student competitiveness, probably limited student support
International students not always understanding the gravity of offenses or what constitutes an offense.
Its uneven application. Students' lack of respect for the system and willingness to cheat.
Honor is very narrowly defined. Cheating on a test is bad, but other more worldly offenses are ignored.
Single sanction, single sanction, single sanction.
Single sanction. Abrogation of responsibility of students to pursue violations.
Lack of understanding, publicity, and reporting (perhaps a broad email once per semester would help disseminate information).
The single-sanction punishment.
Lack of support by all involved
Tacit acceptance that certain questionable behavior is OK.
I won't keep repeating what I've written. This is becoming a waste of my time.
Negative faculty experiences with System, student jury nullification, perception that system is harder on minorities and run by white male fans of authority, huge classes, unwillingness of students to report violations by others, general social tolerance of cheating, ease of copying work in the electronic age.
Some times investigations seem to take too long. I reported a case of cheating by two students and they graduated before the trial took place. Students should be required to report honor violations that they observe. In other words, it should be an honor violation to condone violations by others. Students are much more likely to observe honor violations that

faculty or TA's. They should be put in charge of monitoring such violations.
A student's ability to hire a high-powered lawyer.
Students unwilling to turn in suspected offenders.
I think the system works pretty well. Any normative system tends to be undermined by lack of communication or failure to support it. I think this questionnaire is a helpful reminder. A bit of discussion in a faculty meeting regarding just what counts as plagiarism might be helpful. Some departments or programs are also clearly hotbeds of cheating when compared to others. I had some students in athletic programs do a study for one of my classes in past years in which they investigated cheating among athletes. It was clearly pretty common at that time. This is not to say that it was facilitated by faculty, only that it was systematic and fairly organized among students then, if my informants are to be believed.
The single sanction.
Reluctance to use single sanction and the cumbersome, time-consuming system.
Student attitudes.
Very difficult to get a conviction even when the teacher is morally certain of guilt.
I am not sure that all students buy into the system sufficiently. I think that there is a certain amount of applying the honor concept as a relative thing, applied to the minimum amount necessary, rather than as a guiding principle for all interaction with others. Honor, if truly followed, should govern both large, and small actions, and both in and out of class. The proliferation of Honor Systems at the secondary school levels where disregard (and even some cynicism) is prevalent dilutes respect for the concept of honor.
Well, one is the idea of honor. This is the 21st-century, and there are other moral ideas out there that may reflect how students feel about their role in the University. We want to uphold moral standards, but no cheating is too vague when, as I understand it, offering a fake ID is enough to get you expelled from the University.
Lack of student support.
Maturity of students running system.
The single sanction is the biggest negative factor.
The culture of entitlement so prevalent today, especially evident in the Greek system and in the athletic program.
The single sanction.
Single sanction. Time consuming insignificance of assignment in question. Staff apathy.
Single sanction process. Time-consuming process.
The degree and intention clauses the fact that some students are simply people who cheat.
Slippery slope of what is and isn't cheating. That is nothing new at UVa.
Its internal contradictions.
At the graduate level, orientation is not as systematic or as extensive as at the undergrad level. We have decided to invite a representative to give a special orientation to our new grad students to make sure we all start off on the same page. (re. importance, values, and expectations). That has been a very valuable service.
No one takes it seriously enough.
It does not apply to collaborative work, and the honor advisors do not understand this.
Reluctance of students to confront other students.
Lack of knowledge.
Lack of support from the faculty, including not requiring an Honor pledge and not reporting suspected cheating, lying, and stealing.
It is presumed that all faculty agree with it and there is no room for dissent.
The size of the institution and anonymity of most of the students.
Lack of communication and confusion regarding how the system works.
Successful criminals reduce the effectiveness of law, by compromising the success of law

Q: E2

enforcement. Successful criminals are the result of improved criminal technique, laissez faire and permissive attitudes, and conspiracies to obstruct, evade, or pervert justice. All of this applies.
Unwillingness of students to come down really hard on their peers (because of single-sanction) the lack of seriousness with which many students take the honor pledge the inefficiency of the student tribunals in either presenting evidence or understanding evidence that a faculty member has provided.
Lack of a No-toleration clause which the Honor Code had at one time. Length of time for the process to be conducted - accusation to trial - which is a reason many faculty do not support the Honor System as strongly as they may otherwise. Cultural differences of a diverse student body. Jury nullification. That all cheating is not considered serious.
As a matter of principle, I would like to see the ideal of an honorable community be stressed as much as how to handle offenses. More than you get to take take-home exams, and more about what it means to be a UVa graduate.
Unpunished cheating.
Single sanction, lack of required session on Honor System before being assigned to teach classes.
The one sanction system.
Perceptions among minority students that the system picks on them.
Uncertainty about the process.
The single sanction. Post-graduation convictions. Lawyers Involvement of administrators when important students are objects of trial and it is perceived a greater University interest is served by letting things go. Do you really think, say, the King of Jordan's son would ever be submitted to an honor trial?
Students do little reporting of honor offenses.
The failure of students to report offenses.
Too cumbersome; too much investment of time for faculty already stretched thin by many other commitments
The single sanction. It is too hard an offense and means that faculty are loath to report potential offenses.
The single sanction. If I had a student whom I suspected of, say, cheating on a small written assignment, I would be tempted not to turn them in, though I realize the system requires me to do so.
Single sanction.
Students' reluctance to make accusations. The long durations of cases. Vagueness of the seriousness criterion. Large class sizes: cheating seems to be much rarer in sections of fewer than 25-30 students.
The impersonality in some large, especially required courses. Also, a lack of common assumptions among students and faculty
Nature of modern American society.
Student belief in it.
Student juries do not want to take responsibility for expelling students - especially when cheating is so rampant and students are afraid to find students guilty of actions which they, themselves, have been a party to. As long as the students do not take the system seriously, faculty will continue to take situations into their own hands. This survey asked whether or not I support the Honor System. I FULLY SUPPORT the idea of the Honor System. I do NOT support it as it currently works. This is such a shame. Students lie to me all the time. It is students' responsibility to be honorable. The culture of this University is NOT one of honor, however.
Single-sanction.
I only teach graduate students and although I have them pledge their exams, I have little reason to be concerned with the Honor System.

Q: E2

Single sanction.
Severity of punishment - dismissal.
Faculty ignoring honor offenses.
Misinformation / lack of information.
Lack of complete support by all in the University.
The single sanction prevents faculty and students from reporting violations in some but not all circumstances. This leads to an uneven application of the policy because we all don't have the same level of commitment to the single-sanction based system.
It is not being used as a vehicle to catalogue and deal with reportable offenses.
Faculty and students don't consistently cooperate with it. Many offenses do not seem serious enough for the removal of the student from the educational community; thus the single sanction prevents people from reporting infractions.
Time consuming.
The perception (promoted by the Honor Committee) that less cheating goes on here at UVa.
Size of the University and different backgrounds of students and faculty.
The single-sanction policy and the time-consuming process of initiating and following through upon a case deter faculty and TAs from reporting honor violations.
Lack of support by students or faculty.
I think that because of the severity of the single sanction, faculty may hesitate to report an honor offense.
The single sanction causes students to be reluctant about turning in their classmates. The reports I have heard about honor trials suggest that students sometimes do not take their responsibilities as jurors and as advocates seriously enough.
Unwillingness of other students to report seeing an honor violation.
Students do not want to judge their peers, and expect faculty to do this for them. Faculty are cynical because of the above and do not participate.
Single sanction. Seriousness clause (which is a result of the single sanction in my opinion). Also, recognize that some people are going to cheat regardless of honor. Turning a blind eye to it is unfair to the honest students.
If faculty and / or fellow students do not uphold it, it tends to lose meaning and thus becomes less effective.
Societal tolerance for poor standards of behavior; student apathy.
Single sanction.
General societal changes outside the University.
Pressure on students to get high grades. Teachers who repeat exam questions or composition subjects more than one semester.
The single sanction. That it is student run apart from the faculty and administration.
The single sanction in its present form. The near-absence of student-initiated cases.
Either faculty or students not taking it seriously and not supporting the Honor System can cause it to decrease in effectiveness.
No student accountability for not reporting Honor violations.
Students themselves must sign onto the system.
Students say that the system is student run, yet the vast majority of accusations come from the faculty. Until students make accusations we can't seriously consider it student run.
Single sanction.
Students keep the single sanction for the wrong reasons. I especially believe for many they like that it make it harder to convict someone.
Too few trials. Single sanctions. Better investigation.
No new faculty training.
The seriousness clause and the single sanction. That, and students don't report cases of



Q: E2

cheating.
Reservations about single sanction.
Instructor hesitance over single sanction.
Size of university - students can easily become anonymous in such a large school.
Reluctance to instigate honor proceedings because of the rigidity of the Honor System.
Severity of punishment.
Adversarial trial-based system. Long time between alleged offense and trial.
Undergraduate peer pressure not to report. Faculty / TA disillusionment with the system.
The single sanction.
Lack of knowledge about the system among faculty.
Single sanction. Also, it increases pressure on the faculty / TA to make sure that they are really making the right claim. People may hesitate to report it or at least for me.
Not enough known about it.
Faculty and students' reservation to report someone, and as a result it may not be enforced on as many occasions as necessary.
I think most people take it for granted that both students and faculty understand the system and consequences. Thus, it's not discussed too much.
Black and white punishment severity. Faculty reluctance to ruin a young student's academic career. Faculty using the Honor System as an end-all to cheating.
Absolute punishment (i.e. permanent dismissal), because many jurors vote not guilty because they think the punishment is too harsh for the crime. Also, it seems that the accuser has too much power; they shouldn't be able to state their opinions at the trial because it influences the jury, however fairly or unfairly (if the professor. is bitter and vindictive, this lessens the chance of a fair trial).
That a seemingly minor infraction - like a bounced check - can bring a charge, but that public drunkenness and assault seem to not be addressed. Also, I assume - right or wrong - that students fail to report violations they know of; and students are more likely to know of them than faculty.
A lack of shared understanding of the processes used by the Honor Committee. The political nature of the Honor Committee. The lack of understanding that part of the Honor Systems is that it requires the active participation of both students and faculty.
Real hands-on experience.
The single sanction.
Single sanction.
Having gratuitous items among the violations (public drunkenness); go ahead and expel 95% of students, then. No student will turn another in for this, and this just makes the system into a joke. Same for drug offenses. Having only a single sanction option - often instructors don't turn in students for cheating on something small, like a quiz.
Single sanction; fact that it is very difficult to get a conviction in a case -- this probably has to do with the single sanction and the level of seriousness required for a conviction.
Faculty and TAs don't always report incidents because of the time the process takes. Also, most TAs don't know everything about the Honor Code.
Lack of student honor.
Lack of faculty support and exceptions made for students.
The idea that you are thrown out of the university on your first offense.
Lack of understanding of how the system works and the role everyone from student to faculty member plays.
The harshness of the penalty. Time-consuming process.
Abuse of the conscientious retraction in order to avoid the single sanction. Closed trials that limit the visibility of the system and how it works.

Q: E2

Implementation, single-sanction or nothing - doesn't work for minor offenses. Human nature.
The single sanction system.
The students.
The cheating that occurs that is not punished. A general lack of respect for the tradition.
Lack of commitment to it. A single sanction only works if absolutely everything is reported.
The general understanding that the system is not historically fair. The consequence of expulsion for a first offense.
Single sanction, many times faculty / TAs take it into their own hands (failing student) rather than kicking them out of the university.
Single sanction makes it unlikely that students will report violations especially if the malefactor is popular. Faculty should be entitled to fail students who they regard as cheating regardless of whether or not they are charged with an Honor Code offense.
Lack of understanding of the system. Lack of discussion of the system.
Single sanction.
Single sanction. Because of single sanction, I don't take the Honor System seriously and don't spend time or energy learning about it or enforcing it.
Not having students and faculty understand the Honor System and all it entails.
The necessary time engaged in the process. Concern regarding the welfare of a student for what may be perceived to be first-time offense.
Single sanction keeps students and faculty from raising honor charges. Also, seriousness clause is overly ambiguous.
Single sanction adversarial trial process (which is a result of the single sanction).
Perhaps, too much trust is a naive approach to maintaining academic integrity among the student body. Personally, as an honorable student, I would not care if I am being watched with a skeptical eye, because I would have nothing to hide.
Centrally, the single sanction deters usages of the Honor Committee by faculty members.
The fact that nothing can be done if there is not sufficient proof. Also that the students are not really aware of cheating. I think they need to be reminded what constitutes cheating.
People believe it is unfair and don't support it 100%.
I think the cases in which the Honor Code has worked best is when the classes I've either run or TAed for have been clearest about expectation and policies. I take it from this survey that the Honor Committee sees a problem with faculty knowledge or consensus about honor, which would lead to confusion or inconsistent application of the code. That strikes me as the biggest factor reducing its effectiveness. I said earlier that the single sanction seemed harsh, but that's only a problem for me because students always seem surprised when I mention it. So more clarity about punishment for honor offenses from faculty seems needed, too.
There is not unified opinion / knowledge / support for the system.
The single sanction.
Over-reporting; under-reporting.
Lack of enforcement.
General lack of knowledge amongst faculty members, and ESPECIALLY graduate students.
Faculty not publishing a honor statement in their syllabus or not addressing the Honor Code in their first classes. Also faculty not being vigilant about student pledging of work and not reporting suspected instances of cheating.
Buy in from faculty and students.
Non-participation, lack of support across grounds.
Faculty / TAs not reporting offences - not taking lying / cheating / stealing seriously enough.
It seems that some of the faculty with whom I interact have had a previous experience where a student was clearly cheating and had the case tried unsuccessfully. After such

Q: E2

experiences, they became unwilling to place such incidents in the hands of the Honor Committee.
The impression of many of my fellow TA's is that too much of a burden is placed on teachers who report honor offences.
Uncertainty about how much one has to involve if witness a cheat. And in some cases, can it be anonymous?
Lack of certainty about the Honor Code and Honor Code procedures.
Single sanction; difficulty and time consuming factor of the process.
Too much burden placed on TAs and faculty to report offenses.
I really hate that students or teachers who witness cheating are not required to report it. To me, that undermines our community of trust substantially.
Single sanction. Widespread ignorance of the system. Your informational video is a joke unless you've changed it.
One penalty.
Students' ingenuity and sometimes baffling resolve to cheat, regardless of clearly stated expectations. Also unfamiliarity with the system among graduate instructors and TAs.
Classes that are not graded pass / fail.
Limited role of the faculty - an advisory role has no power. Single sanction - doesn't allow enough flexibility and allow for mistakes by young inexperienced students.
Lack of clarity to all about how it works; inconsistent enforcement.
Lack of knowledge, and a bad reputation.
Student apathy.
The students do not appear to take it that seriously. Writing it on their exams, assignments, etc. is a mindless task, not a meaningful affirmation of their honesty.
The burden of proof that is on the faculty - makes it less likely they will report cheating because they think the student will get off without punishment.
Difficulty of reporting.
Despite the supposed total control over the process by students, the administration seems to feel it can override anything if there is political pressure to do so (e.g., a law suit by a deep pocketed student or their family).
Lengthy arduous process.
The lack of support from faculty erodes the system. If students observe that the system is not supported by faculty then they take it less seriously.
Pretentious student representatives who come to (ineffectively) talk to classes about the Honor System. Not having a graduated punishment system. Lengthy investigation and trial periods.
Loose understanding of what to do when you suspect a student of cheating.
I believe that some faculty members and TAs are unwilling to turn students in because of the gravity of the punishment. In my opinion, this is not their judgment to make. They need to follow the system.
I am new faculty here. So many questions do not apply to me.
Fears of racial discrimination regarding who is charged with an honor offense. Fears of losing control of the outcome once a case has been turned over to the Honor Committee. People who disagree with the single sanction.
Students / faculty not wanting to be responsible for having other students dismissed.
I think the single sanction dissuades some professors from going after a student who has cheated.
The burden of proof required to bring a case as well as the seriousness of the single sanction system heavily discourages faculty members from reporting cases.
The fact that it's known to be a time-consuming process for the instructor who reports an offence.

Q: E2

The complications involved in honor trials.
Decreasing the jury's role in Honor trials would be contrary to the spirit of Honor. Also, juries should vote on Intent separately, instead of voting on Act and Intent together. Juries should continue to be the decision-makers regarding seriousness.
Single sanction.
Honest people will be honest with or without a code, and dishonest people will be dishonest with or without a code.
Harshness of single sanction, time it takes to process honor charges.
Length of time it takes to bring a case to I-Panel or trial. Single sanction. The university not taking plagiarism seriously enough.
People are afraid of a long, arduous, and emotionally painful process; particularly TAs whose primary responsibility is to be here for their own studies. The fact that students are permanently dismissed from the university makes it important to them to not be convicted at any cost, and this has an extreme impact on the instructor who reports the infraction.
The faculty doesn't believe in the system.
TA concerns about liability. Single sanction. Ability to be let off for seriousness - why should this matter? Doesn't cheating on a homework assignment undermine the community as much as cheating on a paper, even if the assignment isn't worth as much? The intention is the same. Seriousness also seems like a way to sneak around the single sanction.
Word of mouth that is negative toward the Honor System, primarily.
The single sanction, the burden on the faculty member to prove guilt, the threat of lawsuits from students' parents.
Need all involved to utilize it in the same manner.
Complexity of process, insufficient support and guidance.
When certain students are treated different, because of relations with faculty and the University. I know for a fact that a fellow student who supposedly committed rape was let off with no penalty because of who he was and who his parents were.
Unfortunately, the diversity and size of the University present challenges in maintaining the sense of community that helps sustain the system. It is also tempting to say that morality and self-responsibility is on the decline, but I put less weight on that cause than on size and lack of homogeneity.
History of the honor cases and results not well known.
Faculty, instructors, and students not ALL adhering to the Honor System.
Outside pressures, inconsistency and faculty distrust.
Faculty and instructors are busy and don't want to be burdened by another thing.
Single sanction.
The single sanction and the time and energy involved in pursuing a case.
The all or nothing approach. If a student cheats on a quiz, it is not enough to get an honor conviction. But there should be some sort of punishment.
The tradition of the Honor System in many ways derives from the code of chivalry and concept of the Southern Gentleman. Many of our students have been raised in this tradition, but sometimes this tradition does not translate across culturally distinct backgrounds.
Uneven implementation.
Pledging.
The single sanction.
Too long and bulky of a process. Single sanction is a problem.
Some professors find the procedures more time consuming than dealing with the issue directly. The Honor System is used more of as a big stick that ultimately places the power in the hand of professors and TAs. In a way, this means that the Honor System is effective, but possibly not in the manner ascribed to it in theory.
Lack of knowledge about the system.

Single sanction, time for processing cases, no separate system for graduate and professional schools.
If faculty do not believe in a single penalty and the offense is considered to be minor they may not report it. This could undermine the process.
The single sanction seems to predispose people to find ways for explaining actions which compromise the intellectual life at the university.
Under-reporting due to single sanction. Under-reporting due to feeling that system doesn't work well.
How strongly the student population believes in and adheres to the Honor System.
Student reluctance to prosecute. Low value for academic integrity in lesser infractions.
Secrecy, inflexibility.
That so much of it is student controlled,
Lack of information as to what the role of the faculty members is in the enforcement of the Honor System. We, the faculty members, encourage students to adhere to the Honor System. But we really lack detailed information to let the offending students know what the consequences of not adhering to the Honor System. I realize that students are informed on the Honor System when they come to the University but reminders are important part of this process.
Immaturity of students - college students should not be deciding the fate of others. Racial bias - it is my impression that more minority students are expelled for honor offences than are white students.
Lack of student and faculty commitment to the values and skepticism of effectiveness.
The single sanction! The excessive rule and procedure orientation of the system.
Some faculty and students are unaware of the honor procedures.
Single sanction.
Unequal adherence to the system.
The single sanction puts jurors in a difficult position if they are not convinced the defendant deserves expulsion even if convicted.
Single sanction. I think teachers are probably hesitant to report all the violations that would count as Honor offenses because the punishment is perceived as too harsh. In addition, I personally have very little respect for a system that holds plagiarizers to a higher standard than rapists and racists. The Honor System is a representation of just how out of order this university's priorities are.
Lack of awareness of the process involved in the Honors System by the faculty. They don't all seem to know the procedures for reporting honors offenses or what happens after they report it.
It will not work if it is not consistently applied. I find that it is consistent in my department.
One factor is the single sanction. Another is that, in recent years, it's become customary that faculty, not students, report honor offenses.
Lack of knowledge about the system.
Tough to get substantial proof. Sometimes it seems that the pledge is just another rubber stamp.
Single sanction.
Professors and students find the single sanction too stern.
Implications of the single sanction.
Students not believing in the system - it doesn't apply to the real world' where people do what they need to get ahead.
Being unaware of options and / or procedures; single-sanction; students reporting students during unsupervised exams. I think it is unreasonable to ask peers to report on each other; I just do not think this occurs on a level required to keep the system vital, effective, and fair for all.

Q: E2

The reluctance of students to exercise punishment is a significant flaw. My comments are hearsay, but the impression I have drawn is that the burden of evidence to expel a student is virtually impossible to achieve. Consequently, in most cases, honor violations are handled internally instead. These impressions of the system's failure undermine its effectiveness.
Apathy on the part of a small minority.
The lengthy process.
Overall culture of cheating among many young people, evident at most high schools. High amount of pressure to succeed.
In my mind, the single sanction is a great shortcoming of the system but it is by no means the only one. My experience with the Honor System left me with great respect for many individual students who worked conscientiously and hard to try to make Honor work. But the System itself is flawed. It is flawed in the exceptions it admits to standards of conduct (e.g., because of not having been paying attention when notified or even not having been able to understand the notice that one was given). It is flawed in its rules of evidence and procedures. It is flawed in the limited and merely amateurish support it gives those who submit cases. It is flawed in punishing harshly with expulsion those students who recognize its legitimacy and respond to valid complaints brought against them honestly and ethically, while rewarding students with clemency when they use opportunistically exploit procedural loopholes, give spurious denials, and act too dumb to be responsible for their own actions. It is flawed because too large a minority of students has no special respect for it. It is flawed because it places too large a burden on faculty who have great disincentives to participating, though they may be coerced into doing so. It is flawed because each honor proceeding is so laborious that the system cannot respond to minor cases appropriately. It is flawed because there is only one sanction and that is a punitive one. There are no possible outcomes of honor proceedings that lead constructively to greater knowledge or better conduct. The only possible outcomes are findings of innocence, dismissal of charges on technicalities, or punishment expelling someone from the community. In other words, the System itself does not exemplify the morals we would nurture in our students: it is not responsive to the particulars of a person's situation; it is neither nimble nor wise; and it is not merciful or humane. Instead, it is rule-bound, cumbersome, and essentially punitive. Does the burden of the past really so heavy upon us that we can do no better than this?
Lack of knowledge, communication.
Students often not punished despite academic dishonesty. Many faculty oppose the system.
The size of the University is a reducing factor. The students feel less like a close-knit community than the smaller schools. Classes are larger so one feels less desire to be honorable.
Single sanction.
I think that sometimes things are not clear-cut - there is no one you can point to. Earlier I used an example when pages of an old test were missing after a test review period. I didn't know which student could be identified. What do you do then? Penalize the whole class - 100 students?
Too many students escape punishment.
Since the sanction is so serious, it seems like it would be a royal pain in the {EXPLETIVE} if I ever did decide to pursue honor charges. This is a big deterrent for me, but maybe OK since the single sanction shouldn't be handed down for most lying, cheating, or stealing anyway.
Single sanction - too harsh not enough student diversity in Honor System athletic department tacitly encourages cheating - they fail to scrub their computers of previous papers, etc.
The single sanction is ridiculous, and completely at odds with societal trends.
Lack of faculty understanding of the system (I am anxious to see the result of your poll!).
Many students lack of commitment to it.
From what I understand, it doesn't cover sexual assault, and it should. From what I understand, faculty often wish, after filing a complaint, that they hadn't, because of the time it involves and disruption it creates in their work lives.

Q: E2

Lack of student commitment.
It's student-run and therefore less professional than it ought to be. The draconian single sanction leads to severe punishment and serious underreporting of honor offenses. Student reporting tends to produce racially skewed results, i.e., students are more likely to report cheating by students who aren't like them.
Biomedical Graduate Programs still use letter grades, and a C is considered failing. This puts undo pressure on the students, and would be relieved by going to pass / fail.
Reluctance to expel fellow students.
The two main factors are hesitancy about the single sanction and complacency.
The single sanction, which makes faculty members reluctant to report suspected offenses. It is a draconian punishment that does not recognize that a person may amend his life after dishonoring himself.
Its inconsistencies.
Seems pretty scary on the surface.
Honor is not as valued as it once was.
Lack of support from students. Also, the threat of litigation affects outcomes in some cases where the accused has access to the necessary resources. This way of escape from conviction or a poor grade only breeds cynicism and resentment.
Some sense that it is unfairly applied - that minority students are charged more often.
Onus on faculty to report and pursue charges of cheating.
Haven't really thought about it.
The single sanction is by far the greatest impediment.
Threat of expulsion.
Uneven enforcement.
Failures to report by students.
Big classes.
Lack of student and faculty buy-in, which I believe is due in large part to the single-sanction policy.
Not enough awareness or 'buy-in' on the part of faculty.
Heterogeneity of the population and size have been two major factors.
Our culture and society is losing the integrity. If we allow the people who have power and money to get by, the students' crime of peeping their next seat student's test seems minor. As a teacher, I would announce to the whole class. Please look at your own test, not your neighbor's, but I won't report to the Honor Committee. I don't know how much time and energy will be involved if I report a serious case to the Honor Committee. If I need to write reports, sitting in the court several times and being interviewed with the Committee members, I might as well handle it by myself, such as lowering that student's grade. I don't know much about the Honor System at UVa, other than the student body has been talking about it in the past year and there is a pledge above the blackboard in almost all the classrooms.
Not enough communication.
The nuclear bomb nature of the punishment.
A sense that the single sanction is inherently unfair and unjust.
Student's culture is a cheating culture.
The single sanction stipulation reduces reporting offenses by faculty and students.
The time it takes to prove a plagiarism offense.
Too cumbersome.
Same exams given over and over.
Students are not just as guilty for failing to report an Honors violation.
The ability to fail a student for cheating without reporting it to the Honor Committee.

Q: E2

The rigidity of the sanctions.
Inconsistency - fake IDs are not an honor offense-is that a mixed message.
The single sanction prevents some students and faculty members from bringing charges.
Single sanction.
Single sanction; being student run.
The fact that students don't tend to report other students and the fact that the process of reporting a case is lengthy and may deter faculty members from initiating cases. Another problem is that many cases are against certain sectors of the student body - which can make the system seem as though it is discriminating against these students.
The single sanction.
Misunderstanding and not being educated about the system.
Assuming all is fine, unfair punishments, inadequate punishment and follow-up. Crowding in class during exams. Too much reliance on independence without supervision.
Failure of students to monitor students and enforce Honor Code.
The fact that in my experience the people involved are mostly attorney "wannabees" who have watched too much Law and Order.
Students find excuses, such as lack of seriousness of the offense, that allow them not to dismiss a student from the University.
Inconsistency - cheating is cheating. However, some professors take into account the intent / seriousness of the offense before reporting it.
The students.
As mentioned earlier, the ONLY significant (but in fact crippling!) problem is the single sanction.
Poor consistency in application of rules. The single sanction deters reporting and leads to many unjust acquittals on the 'seriousness' criterion. The administration of the system is often capricious and unduly demanding on faculty members.
The sense among members of the student body that cheating is not important. Also, the low rate of conviction for honor offences.
Faculty and students not taking it seriously guilty students not being sanctioned because of single sanction.
Incomplete reporting of infractions by students and faculty.
The obstinate refusal to tamper with the single sanction, out of a misplaced faith in tradition.
Students in charge of running the system.
Visibility of the system.
The single sanction.
Our culture. From early on, many kids see their parents skirt issues, bend rules, and assist the kids in minimizing any infractions they may have committed. When they come to UVa, that's what they are used to. It isn't easy. Lots of pressure for good grades to get a job, honors, etc.
Many students ignore it.
Single sanction. Testimonial nature of evidence.
Single penalty is excessive.
Students do not police each other.
Lax enforcement.
Single sanction. Uncertainty about fairness; uncertainty about competence of student who run the system and act as jurors.
Complacency among students. If support for the system is minimal, there will be little compliance.
Single sanction.
I have been here for five years and I have no close relationship with the Honor System. In



Q: E2

my opinion, there is no need for it as we should follow its guidelines anyway but I suppose it works well as a propaganda and recruiting thing. However, like I said, the inflexibility is fatal. In too many ways, it is a system that punishes people unfortunate enough to be caught instead of chronic transgressors. I really think there should be more involved in deciding cases than whether or not the Honor Code was broken.
The single sanction.
Single sanction.
Break down of the system in very large classes. Tradition and prestige are what hold the system together; this idea is instilled in entering first years, but not with new graduate students/faculty who are trusted to uphold it.
A sense of arbitrary and unequal enforcement, in the wake of the Physics case.
Unwillingness to convict.
Kicking students out of school rarely happens, so cheaters often get off "scott free."
My impression is that the time commitment involved in bringing up an honor charge is quite large, which makes me less likely to report an offense.
Single sanction and overly technical or complex procedures and doctrines.
Putting faculty in charge of reporting violations.
Students tolerate one another's cheating. It's very hard for faculty to prove or disprove cheating when they suspect it.
Single sanction and seriousness clause.
Single sanction, no way to deal with infractions that are not as egregious or have less evidence. Extreme evidence is needed for conviction. The level of evidence needed appears to be so high that few cases fit the criteria.
The single sanction the elite representation on the Honor Committee.
The size of the student body. History - people want the system because it is historical, even though it does not work and there is not much faith in the system as it stands today.
Strikes me as somewhat anachronistic and idealistic.
Perhaps not understanding the system itself.
Time and bad press.
My perception is that if a professor reports an offense, it probably takes a good deal of his or her time to work this through the Honor System. I say this based on the amount of coverage given to professors who have reported violations. I also think of the emotional toll on the professors as well as the time.
The single sanction.
The student committing the violation gets to choose a jury of all students. Students are reluctant to permanently remove other students from the university, especially when they deem the infraction to be of a small nature. There is no definition of what is a small nature - if cheating is cheating, then it should not matter that the assignment was only worth 6% of the grade. There need to be more options than just expelling a student - flunking the course should be another option if the infraction is not deemed of a serious enough nature, but the student is deemed guilty.
It is run by students, not the faculty. The single sanction lowers the probability of ANY sanction.
Students and faculty are very reluctant to report cheating or other violations because there is only one (drastic) sanction possible. This doesn't accord with the mission of the university to educate. Also, the perception is that the person bringing the charge is often put very much on the defensive, almost on trial him or herself.
Failure of students to attend Honor System introductory session upon entering the university.
Reluctance to report Honor violations because of single sanction. Sometimes errors that to the Instructor or an expert are thought of as statistical impossibilities, to the layman there are just common errors that can be attributed to students studying together and since many of the infractions noticed are of this type they are rarely brought up to the Honor System.

The time involved in reporting honor violation.
Its ill-conceived and unethical foundations.
Single sanction.
Too much work for students.
I don't think that the word "honor" really calls upon a significant feature in students' characters anymore - it's an anachronistic appeal. Students who cheat seem to be focused on getting what they can, rather than on learning. I don't see the Honor System as having any claim on such students. I'd rather, as faculty, have more say in whether or not a student has fulfilled the expectations of the course - I'd rather that other faculty, administrators, and perhaps a few students were jointly involved in appeals of my decisions. And I think the single sanction has the effect of trivializing cheating.
Unequal enforcement across faculty members.
Students not being turned in for smaller infractions. Faculty may be hesitant to report cases due to the extreme nature of the consequences. I wonder what the deal is with underage drinking. I was under the impression that this was an honor violation, especially most of the students use fake identification. Drinking at parties is one thing, but 18 year olds using fake IDs and getting ridiculously drunk is another. They are an embarrassment to the University.
Faculty members distrust that the jury will convict guilty students. Faculty / TAs / jury members are intimidated by the seriousness of the consequences, and may not report cheating.
Reluctance of teachers to file complaints and take action against cheating behavior.
I think the one punishment (getting kicked out of school) is actually bad.
I cannot answer this question because I am on a leave of absence and have not started teaching at UVa.
The single sanction. While I have not been involved in any Honor Committee proceedings, I don't think that I can support expulsion for all honor offenses.
Reluctance of students to report cheating by their peers.
Honor investigations can be lengthy. Many faculty have reported negative experiences when involved in honor trials.
The herd mentality of some groups of students, who try to justify a lesser penalty for cheating.
Lack of actual enforcement; most infractions probably go unreported.
Single sanction.
Students run the system.
Faculty support.
Faculty criticism of the code - its ambiguity.
The single sanction.
The students are tempted most probably because many of them are never caught, and so they think they can risk it. The other problem is the internet: it has become far too easy for them to download and cheat with minimal changes from the original.
Single sanction, inconsistent enforcement.
One sanction.
Negative faculty and TA feelings about single sanction that result in failing students rather than reporting them to the Honor System.
Not everyone takes it seriously.
Generally I think the system is strong. Nevertheless, I think the fact that many actions that most of us would consider lying are not covered by the Honor System--or nor recognized by students as being covered by the Honor System - are tolerated is an overall weakness. For example, students regularly lie in email messages requesting course action into one of my courses. I've had students tell me that one of my sections was the only class that would fit their schedules when that was not at all true. (When I receive such messages, I immediately

ask a secretary to check the student's schedule on ISIS.) This past fall, I uncovered several such liars, and immediately wrote them, noting their limitations with respect to honor in general. One of the little scumbags actually had the audacity (or stupidity) to write one of my colleagues with the same plea for a course action a week later (and it was still a lie). I have also run into problems with students who have no intention of being in my classes registering for them to save a spot for friends whose registration priority was lower. Last fall, for example, I emailed a student who persisted for a couple of weeks on the roll of one of my classes. She responded by noting that she had no intention of taking the course, but that she was saving a spot for a friend. Frankly, I think she's a liar and a cheat. She also stole a spot that another student could have taken. I also think the fact that students think the Honor System doesn't apply to off-Grounds actions is a problem.
Severity of punishment.
The single sanction.
Cheating is not every time the same. One has to distinguish more.
Lack of awareness. I myself would worry that the Honor Committee system is too formal and the penalties potentially too harsh?
Reinforcement from peers.
Single sanction seems to limit options for resolution.
Student unwillingness to report due to single sanction. Visibility of minority students in UVa classrooms may lead to increased scrutiny by faculty and, above all, by fellow students, leading to a racial imbalance in honor charges. More generally, it is a system run by overburdened amateurs.
I would imagine that the lack of any possibility for proportional response might prevent both students and faculty from reporting infractions.
Faculty non-support of the system (especially regarding the single sanction). This attitude is filtered down to junior colleagues / graduate students and may result in a failure to discuss the Code in class or to initiate cases.
I don't know. I only work with medical students / residents in a clinical situation. I never administer tests.
Students deny they have violated it, and are let free without repercussions.
Many undergraduates don't care about it.
Student-athletes.
That the only option if a student is found in violation of the Honor Code is permanent expulsion from the university.
Unfamiliarity with the policy. Lack of strict adherence by students and / or faculty.
Cases that go un-reported weaken the system.
Students who cheat feel they are unlikely to get caught, and very unlikely to be expelled.
Lack of information to faculty, TA's, and students.
Examples of blatant cheating evidence on a test and the student is not convicted
Understanding of the system by both students and faculty, especially in graduate programs working with part-time students.
The students are not given an orientation about the Honor System, especially for international students.
Everyone is busy and I think that by reporting an honor offence, faculty members might think it's going to be a very timely process.
Too time consuming, too hard to convict.
The single sanction.
In some cases, I have felt the penalty too severe for the infraction.
I think it is inevitably that as the University grows, the Honor System will be less effective.
Lack of participation and lack of knowledge by the faculty.
All faculty not supporting the system at the same level.

Q: E2

The entire process takes too long - with breaks at every vacation, summer, exam time, etc. It's too cumbersome. (There should be some way to triage cases based on evidence or severity).
The single sanction and faculty reluctance to charge students, given such a drastic level of punishment. Faculty perception that bringing an honor charge results in a prolonged, frustrating, unsatisfactory experience.
Lack of knowledge.
Teacher belief that the system will expose them, chew up vital time, and not produce a conviction.
The penalties are too serious: expelling a student only because of some mild cheating is ridiculous. The Honor System jury is made of students who often feel in charge and important because they are for the first time in their life make important decisions. In a way religious background matter: lack of forgiveness, intolerance towards lies are typical of Judeo-Protestant cultures, such as the American culture. Most European students find the system ridiculous. Many oriental students would copy a few lines from the web without thinking that it is wrong. The cultural background affects students' conduct. Most faculty members don't trust the system because of the type of jury that would make the final decision.
Not visible in graduate or professional schools.
People not wanting to go through the hassle of calling out students on violations.
Single sanction.
Self-serving definitions about what constitutes lying, cheating, and stealing.
TAs do not feel that incidents are taken seriously by the Committee - i.e., students are rarely convicted and, when they are, the consequences are so light as to not serve the purpose.
The negative perception that students have is detrimental to this system.
Reluctance to report cheating on the part of students and teachers. Students knowing that it is not likely they will be reported.
Some academic activities require group interactions, and the students sometimes get used to relying on others, so their thinking gets sloppy and they presume they can get away with cheating.
The quality and experience of the jury in some cases.
Reluctance to get involved.
The difficulty in obtaining a conviction.
Underreporting and a general lack of caring by the general student population who don't have a background in personal ethics.
Students / faculty not reporting instances of cheating.
Faculty support.
Student short-terms.
Not visible enough.
Harsh penalty, exacerbated by the unfair implementation.
Lack of specific awareness,
The single sanction system.
Lack of understanding of the process (I, as well as most TA's and faculty I know, am guilty of falling into this category). Obvious signs around campus that there is disagreement among students about it's validity/effectiveness.
Lack of understanding of its process.
Single penalty.
Individual students and faculty failing to understand their absolute obligation to report cheating. Their concern over the consequences of the single sanction makes them susceptible to ethical compromises that are incompatible with the principle of honor.
Lack of understanding about it.

Q: E2

Inadequate emphasis among faculty.
Single sanction, lack of time management skills and bad work-study habits among students.
Student apathy and single sanction.
Single sanction impression that it's unfavorable to minorities, student-athletes, non-Greek students and favors Greek-affiliated students.
I think many students don't take the Honor Code very seriously. I also think that some students target others, watching their behavior more carefully. I also think the single sanction prevents some reporting of real problems.
Weakened by offenses not detected or addressed.
I wonder sometimes if it's become like wallpaper. It's there, but after a while, one may tend to not notice it.
Single sanction. Time and hassle concerns.
Communication with faculty (especially less than full time).
The single sanction. International students.
Knowing it is out there in the system.
Single sanction.
Lack of understanding.
Ignorance.
Single sanction policy.
Widespread cheating that goes unsanctioned. Cases of acquittal where a reasonable jury would seem to have to see the true cheating.
The single sanction. The lack of belief in its effectiveness I hear from many faculty. A culture of permissiveness around cheating due to the handy availability of so many internet sources coupled with students' misunderstanding of what exactly cheating is. The fact that other aspects of cheating and lying (i.e., using a fake ID) aren't included.
Single sanction. Lengthy trials run by self-important students.
The grueling process of going before the committee.
Unclear. I obviously need to know more about the Honor System.
I think the greatest threat to the Honor System is the existence of students with out ethics or integrity.
None that I know.
The single sanction that instructors don't see as fair. The idea that we need to attend any sort of trial if we find evidence of cheating.
Not reporting offenses. Lack of faculty support.
Single sanction, unwarranted trust.
I think the biggest factor is the lack of dedication of some students and faculty to supporting the Honor System and its values. Some faculty members with whom I have spoken have gone through the process of bringing a charge and following up with an Honor trial only to have the charges dismissed. The recently publicized case in which somehow the student was found guilty, but was acquitted (I'm unsure of the exact ruling because it made no earthly sense) destroys confidence in the System. Faculty and TA's hear from their fellows how emotionally wrenching it is to bring an Honor charge against a student. Some teachers might be hesitant to go through all that if they have the sense that fair consequences will not be meted out in the end.
Uniformed instructors.
That it is perceived as ineffective and not respected.
Extreme punishment like student permanent dismissal.
People don't want to get people dismissed for small things, and trials are an involved process that take a lot of time for both the reporter and the accused.
Students don't want to kick other students out of school. Faculty / TAs don't want to become

Q: E2

involved in a time consuming process.
Lack of knowledge about it.
Many professors believe that the single sanction is too harsh of a punishment for minor cheating, thus do not report some infractions because the don't want to be responsible for the dismissal of students over a small offense.
It's not discussed during courses.
Faculty members who are too permissive and refrain from initiating honor cases because they are uncomfortable with the single sanction rule.
Inconsistency and ease of handling it ones self.
The question of what is an Honor violation. I feel that Honor violations ought to be more clearly defined because actions away from the University could be considered violations.
Expulsion from the university regardless of severity of infraction is unjust so individuals fail to report activities that they believe should not result in expulsion.
Does not seem to apply to studio workshops.
Single sanction. Lack of enforcement on minor infractions. Seriousness / triviality clause.
Pledged work is too ubiquitous. Instructors should be encouraged to allow students to work together on more homework and other minor assignments, since they are probably going to do it anyways. If minor honor infractions are too easy to commit or too vaguely defined, then everyone quickly becomes a criminal and everyone disregards the Honor System in general. I often notice that most students automatically sign their pledge at the beginning of exams (just like they do on less significant assignments) without really considering what it means.
As far as I know it works very well.
Student willingness to disregard the system and failure to take responsibility for their own actions.
Maintaining the single sanction. Abandoning the non-toleration clause. Adding the conscientious retraction clause.
Lack of knowledge.
Occasionally, student attitudes about honor violations. Not so much a problem in the Law School. Some honor trials seem political in nature.
Lack of information.
The amount of time and effort required even when a TA is sure cheating has happened.
Students not understanding their role within the Honor System may be seen as punitive rather than maintaining a code of ethics to live by.
Lack of communication regarding the Honor System.
Single sanction reduces reporting.
It is completely student administered.
Not many students especially international student know the detail of the Honor System although they know some common mistakes.
Don't understand higher question: Why should we try to reduce the effectiveness?
One more time: lack of non-toleration clause. This makes the students view reporting honor offenses as ratting on their fellow students. You are putting the honorable students in an awkward position.
It's possible the Honor System requirements reduce effectiveness of learning by setting unnecessary prohibitions.
Not aware of any.
Single sanction makes it less likely that violations will be reported, opportunities for racism.
The ambiguity of the system and the single sanction for every offense, regardless of seriousness.
Few people enjoy destroying the lives of others - even if the others have made a serious error in judgment. Some (faculty and students) honestly don't understand the importance of character as a component of formal education, and because they have been raised or

Q: E2

socialized to lie, cheat, or steal (after all, everyone does it), they view the Honor System as an annoyance.
The students have neglected their responsibility to report violations.
Reluctance to cause expulsion of students.
Bureaucracy.
Honor is less a part of the culture. People are reluctant to report violations because they are not willing to take responsibility for drastically affecting other people's lives.
Only have one penalty for being found guilty of an honor offense.
It's not strongly felt in the school of medicine - different teaching environment that should be explored with respect to these issues.
One punishment option.
Students don't always report cheating they see and most faculty view the process as time consuming.
The extreme nature of the punishment (single section).
Lack of faith in system.
As I noted earlier, the system is not sufficiently integrated into a broader educational and regulatory culture. My relative ignorance of the system's details reflects my sense that, if a cheating case arises, I'll find out what to do - but otherwise the system is too limited in its scope and relevance for me to be motivated to be more attentive to it and its rules.
It is trivial to base it on lying cheating and stealing, when things like rape and assault go virtually unpunished.
The law school.
Inadequate education re reporting.
The single sanction mechanism.
Probably the practice of single sanction which makes people reluctant to report honor violations.
Single sanction. Time consuming.
Punishments.
Time commitment required of accusers and perception that faculty are put on trial vs. offending student.
Single sanction. Students not obligated for investigating what they observe as possible cheating and puts burden of identifying cheating solely on faculty and TA's.
Not knowing about it.
Lack of communication.
Lack of time and maturity on the part of students. Many faculty members do not trust the system because of past experiences.
Perception of student bias.
Low reporting rate Single sanction => lower reporting?
Time factors. Benefit of the doubt factors.
Increasing pressure on grade point for entrance into graduate and professional schools.
Lax moral standards of students and faculty.
Lack of transparency to faculty - I have been at the university for five years and I am sure some of my answers here are wrong!
It seems to me that students can lie but we have no choice but to take their words for it.
Single sanction.
The students do not take it seriously, or else they would not cheat. If they believed in the single sanction of being expelled, they would (surely) never risk it. But they don't believe it will happen. So they cheat.
The harshness of the one-strike-out policy.
Single sanction. Students are reticent to expel for anything other than egregious violations,

Q: E2

rendering typical violations not punishable. Students running the process lack training and supervision necessary to insure the process of integrity.
Perhaps a lack of understanding on the part of some faculty.
Trials are not done seriously.
The single sanction.
Single sanction, ineffectiveness of honor trials.
Lack of student participation in reporting offenses. Perceived leniency of the Honor Court. Low reputation of the system among many faculties.
The fact that no one is required to report Honor violations. What's the point of having the system in place?
The Honor Committee.
I have suspected that athletic coordinators in the football office have written students' papers. I have visited athletic study halls to see students exchanging assignments. When discussing a student-athlete with an academic coordinator from athletics, she told me that she would be willing to type a student's dictated their paper.
Unequal punishments (those given to rapists and those give to students who cheat), single sanction.
Student cynicism, the internet, liar politicians like Bill Clinton and George Bush.
Single sanction. Fact that assault is not an honors offense.
The current controversy about the single sanction is focusing on the wrong part of the problem. The real point is how effectively does the Honor System function and whether or not the threat of single sanction impedes guilty verdicts or not.
Single sanction means that people are less likely to report honor violations.
The perception that it is a time sink for everyone involved, and the end result may not be worth the effort.
Teachers don't know how it works.
Not wanting to report because penalty is harsh.
Perception that legal challenge will render decision mute. Perceived laborious process. Expulsion not required for most violations
The lack of clear introduction that a new member of the community receives greatly hampers the effectiveness of the Honor Code. Also the single punishment of expulsion greatly reduces the chances of someone bringing it to the honor council.
The one penalty system.
Many students will not provide evidence of guilt of others.
Low probability of penalty for cheating. Purely guessing, I'd guess that the students are somewhat cynical about the system and somewhat disposed to overlook cheating.
Student reluctance to turn someone in. Fear of litigation.
I think the Honor System could use more faculty input and a higher profile.
Lack of knowledge. Perception that system dates from the old-boy days and hence reflects old-boy values. E.g., I'm told that rape is not an honor violation. Indeed, the word honor calls up images of courtly southern culture, which is not a place I imagine is hospitable to me.
Not reporting an honor offense, partly because there is just one penalty for it.
Reluctance to get students expelled from the university. (But, fortunately, I've never encountered a clear-cut honor violation.) I have an impression, possibly quite erroneous, that the burden of initiating honor cases falls mostly on faculty and TAs - which suggests to me that it is not the undergraduates who are really keeping the system afloat. In principle, I think that a student-run Honor System is a good thing. The question is this: does this system promote the human quality of honor amongst our students? Or do students experience this system as just another--perhaps more special--university institution, not wholly unlike courses, for example. My point is that UVa students, bright, gifted, fine people as they truly



Q: E2

are, do not strike me as any more honorable than students at other schools.
Racism, student apathy, societal pressure to succeed.
It really doesn't come up in my work experience.
Lack of student action. The typical student will not use the system.
The single sanction.
Single sanction.
Single sanction, the ambiguousness of the language of the Honor Code, and general student apathy.
Lack of information for faculty, extremity / inflexibility of penalties.
I do not believe the students take it as seriously as they need to. In many ways, societal values have changed, unfortunately.
Based on discussions with colleagues, students themselves are reluctant to report violations of the Honor Code, though it is their system. Faculty that report violations view it after the fact as a waste of time given the amount of trouble involved. Faculty reporting honor violations view the treatment by the Honor Committee as hostile.
It is simply too large a student body to effectively work. The same Honor System has been in existence since UVa. had less than 2000 students. Now it has ten times that number.
Single sanction.
The single sanction policy. Professors prefer to deal with the problems on their own.
Single sanction inappropriate assessment methods by professors.
Too lenient.
Internet resources.
The credibility of Honor Committee Members, disinterest among faculty in discussing it, and graduate student unfamiliarity with the process.
Single sanction renders students unwilling to use the system to combat cheating.
Racial bias.
I have been at UVa since 1982 and Honor System reform, as far as I can remember, has been discussed every year since then with no real changes. Perhaps I am wrong and substantive changes have been made. As far as I can tell if no changes have been made over the decades then we should stop wasting resources and time in discussing it, it appears to work well across the generations.
It's different at the centers than at Charlottesville. We have more mature students who generally work independently. They are truly interested in learning and not just getting a grade.
Dependence on students reporting students.
Additional work to investigate each case and to achieve the fairness of the outcome.
Defaulting in monitoring compliance in large classes.
A lack of respect for one's work and one's class.
Failure to report offenses.
First-strike-and-out policy (assuming I understand it correctly), lack of information / awareness among students / staff.
Students are not respectful of faculty time. Students not harsh enough in sanctioning guilty students - the intent factor is ridiculous.
Lack of knowledge.
Single sanction. Lack of confidence in reporting system. Lack of confidence in trial system. Too much "old boy" influence.
Inconsistent interpretation and / or enforcement of the rules. Lack of commitment to Honor Code because of single sanction.
Prejudice, inconsistency, insensitivity.
Overly severe punishment and lengthy trials.

Lack of knowledge of the Honor System.
I think that the single sanction makes students and faculty reluctant to report violations.
Lack of participation of all the parts.
Student apathy is the biggest weakness of the Honor System. All other problems are minor by comparison.
Single sanction discourages reporting of offenses.
Reluctance of students to report infractions they observe.
Lack of training for new graduate students.
There is a sharp divide between student life in class and student life after class. There is little continuity between the two areas so it is difficult to identify an honorable lifestyle. If the academic community condones dishonorable actions outside of class, it cannot expect consistent honorable decisions in class. The Honor Code bears no importance in the daily life of the student. Furthermore, there is little recourse for dishonorable actions on or off grounds. If there is no punishment, there is no reason to abide by any system of ethics.
No, I don't but I'd like to add that I am very happy to teach at a university that has an Honor System.
Single sanction. Being run by students. Student apathy honors-eggheads obsessed with preserving the system as it is Law students who think the honors system is a place to practice.
Lack of familiarity.
Complacency.
Single sanction.
Too many other needs, demands on time, primarily research and developing educational content, make the Honor System a lower priority in faculty life.
Outmoded and sentimental allegiance to the traditional system.
Leniency in the classroom, allowing cheaters to avoid any chance of getting caught.
The single sanction.
Lack of unified approach by all involved.
Lack of faculty involvement Lack of clarity over what constitutes an Honor Code violation.
Severity of sanctions.
If a student is under enough pressure to pass a class, it could well happen that he / she would cheat, and because everyone is so trusting, it would be fairly easy.
There are a lot of chances for the system to break down - so it may often do so. Students don't report cheating, faculty don't report cheating.
Student unwillingness to report honor offenses.
Frequent balloting by students on whether or not to change the rules of the System.
The single sanction needs rethinking.
The extreme nature of the single punishment available.
There should be more funding for search engines that detect cheating in essay assignments. There should be funding to scan all papers in into a department database in order to eliminate cheating in the Greek system from year to year.
If faculty members do not report cheating, the effectiveness is highly doubtful.
Faculty buy-in, any appearance of mismanagement or incompetence (of which there is next to none).
Faculty apathy and distrust of UVa students as arbiters. Faculty inability to work with students to resolve honor issues like plagiarism.
Graduate student instructors do not have time to follow the Honor Code hearing process to its conclusion. It's my understanding that accused students are permitted to retain legal counsel who drag the process out and call the instructors' credibility into question in the defense of the student- client. Students should not be permitted to hire outside

Q: E2

representation; if the whole procedure were much faster, more cases would be reported and processed. Also it's my sense that colleagues are unwilling to have the offending students thrown out of the University, and so don't report offenses when they otherwise might.
Allowing offenders to continue at UVa. Once the penalty is removed, the gray area is difficult to enforce.
Lack of awareness. Rumors of unfairness
Single sanction.
Lengthy processing.
Pity.
It is overly elaborate and separate from the rest of UVa administration. Even surveys like this are an indication of that.
It seems terribly unfair, discriminatory, and biased on racial lines. It also seems ignorant of academic processes, cooperation, collective work, and citation.
Single sanction. Cumbersome process.
Single sanction which is too punitive for some faculty and the amount of time involved when reporting a case.
Teaching assistants are reluctant to report possible offenses because of the single-sanction policy.
The single sanction. No definition of the DEGREE of offense. Look outside to the wider world: NOWHERE adopts a binary system for both the degree of crime and the punishment. A manifestation of wisdom is the recognition that right and wrong lie on a continuum, that societal response to breaking its norms must also lie on a continuum. To think otherwise is to live in an idealistic fantasy world.
Lack of support by faculty members and the fact that there is only an option for a single sanction. The amount of time involved given a single sanction; it would be better with other options. Too often students don't get punished because of the severity of the sanction.
The single sanction. It is both the best part of the system and its only drawback. Some people aren't brave enough to do something that could result in expulsion. Those people are the problem, not the Honor System.
Numbers. Students feel that the odds are in their favor of not getting caught.
Lack of student awareness / interest.
Concern about the time commitment required
Bad press in Cavalier Daily.
Relatively less emphasis on the Honor System in the orientation program.
I have limited knowledge in this area, but it would seem to me that with such harsh penalties, a sort of us against them mentality permeates the student body which becomes quite counterproductive to the whole purpose of the Honor Code.
Too big, too political.
Over reliance in the system, too much trust.
Single sanction.
Fear of the system itself. A widespread American culture of deception.
All or none penalty.
Large classes, single sanction, student apathy and lack of commitment to Honor System.
Low profile.
The effectiveness of UVa's Honor System is reduced by the many students who do not believe in the single sanction. They are mirroring the decline of the concept of honor within our modern society. As a result, they actually feel morally justified to not apply the Honor System. They believe that justice requires a range of punishment for a range of transgression. In my view, that would be fine except there is no range for honor. An individual either is honorable or he isn't.
Single sanction. Unproctored exams.

Q: E2

Some members of the Honor Code committee seem very gung-ho about suspending students.
The fact that some people are just not honorable.
Apathy. I have read of instances where the faculty have reservations about the use of the Honor System (e.g. {NAME} in Physics). I believe that his concerns do carry great merit. If the offenses are lying, cheating, or stealing with respect to one's submitted work, then the student run court is required to punish with either suspension or expulsion from the University. The fact that faculty have lost respect with the process. The students must punish offenders effectively so that faculty members and peers develop a renewed respect for the Honor Court and Honor System.
Single sanction, the fact it exists.
It has always seemed that students entering my class were well aware of the Honor Code. I take this to mean that it is consistently being applied across the university.
Too many hurdles and time consuming.
Single sanction. Unwillingness of students to initiate cases.
Accusations of racial bias.
Cynicism among the faculty taking matters into their own hands.
Noncompliance by faculty members if and when students are caught or suspected of cheating or lying.
Lack of familiarity, especially on the part of adjuncts. Also unwillingness of students to report violations. I know of one student who admits seeing someone cheat on a final and did nothing about it.
Unclear policies, lack of education to faculty about it.
It relies on students. Single sanction makes reporting much less likely.
I have never been told about the Honor System, and I have been at UVa for four years.
Failure to report infractions.
The School of Architecture presents an interesting situation, as most work is studio based. The only infractions I have suspected are students working past the prescribed deadline. This is rare though.
Single sanction, long delay between allegation and trials, adversarial relation to faculty, frequent cheating by student athletes.
I have spoken at some length with a faculty member who went through with an Honor System 'case'. He said that he would never do it again, because of multiple reasons.
Because of the system's current configuration, it is not uniformly served. This is a huge problem.
Widespread apathy and low moral expectations.
Students do not follow the Honor Code.
Faculty and student apathy and loss of confidence in the Honor System.
Severe penalties make people less likely to report
Single sanction. Holier than thou attitude
The size of the University. The concept of community becomes tenuous at best when you are talking about 20,000 students. An over-emphasis on enforcement and not nearly enough attention paid to the development of honor as a personal virtue.
It seems working well.
Students not turning each other in/ not taking seriously. Also, sexual assault should be an honor violation! Students are violating Honor Code if using a fake ID and these are very prevalent at UVa.
Single sanction. Requiring students to report offenses even when they did not observe it directly.
Not culturally accepted by students.
Noncompliance by students and faculty.

All or none approach to cheating.
The issue of single sanction.
The single sanction plus the confusing issue as to whether we as faculty are responsible for evaluating the seriousness of the charge.
Current American legal system. Single sanction. General opportunistic nature of current culture.
Widespread distaste for the purposes of the system. Recalcitrance of human nature.
The one offense and you're out.
Failure of faculty members to actually read student work thoroughly - this sends students the message that it doesn't matter what they write because the professor does not look at it closely enough to tell if there has been an Honor Code violation.
The hanging on of a worn out UVa tradition, and the students' support of it through their actions - if a student is not a cheater, he / she does not need to tell someone they are so. If a student is going to cheat, asking them to write a pledge is not the answer; getting them to figure out a better option than cheating is.
Reluctance to report infractions.
Willingness to excuse offenses that are too trivial.
Fear.
Single sanction (resulting in sympathy for those accused / looking for loopholes). Corruption. Faculty who don't want the time and aggravation of bringing a case forward.
The single sanction. For some cases, it's just too harsh.
Fear of what happens after reporting a possible case of cheating.
It was my understanding that, on observing an honor offense in the classroom, the professor asks another student to report the offense. This has always seemed to me an unfair and inappropriate burden to place on a student; the preceding questions suggest, however, that this is no longer (if it was ever!) the policy, but that one is to report the offense to a member of the Honor Committee. I also find the single sanction unjustifiable.
Such strong sanctions.
Presenting students with options (such as taking closed-book exams at home) that tempt sneaking a peak at notes, etc. Not requiring students to pledge work; not going over the Honor Code rules and consequences for infractions.
My impression is that guilty students are often not punished, and those who bring charges against them have thus gone through a grueling process for nothing.
General trends in the larger student culture that make particular restrictions in the Honor Code seem anachronistic or which make honorable conduct at UVa highly specialized.
As a new member of the faculty, I believe a lack of information reduces the effectiveness of the Honor System.
Students no longer needing to report honor offenses - my understanding is that currently faculty report more than a majority of honor offenses.
I'm wondering if the students know all the ins and outs of the system - as a faculty member, I feel somewhat ill-informed about the system in general, but if faced with some kind of honor violation, I feel I would learn quickly and easily what recourse(s) I (or the offending student) has.
Apart from questioning whether the single sanction may be too absolute as a punishment and thinking it should take the severity of the infraction into account, I also worry about the stigma for a student who is brought up on honor charges. In other words, I sometimes think that, with the rumor mill being what it is, a student is sometimes declared guilty before he or she is proven so, just because of the shadow of suspicion that an honor charge automatically casts.
Not enough emphasis is placed on honor as a positive concept, which makes it easier for the minority of students and faculty with ideological objections to the idea of honor to promulgate a sense of cynicism that undermines support for the Honor Code.

Q: E2

The reliance on individual integrity.
Students who countenance cheating by others and don't report it. Juries that are too reluctant to convict.
The unfairness. The single sanction.
Lack of understanding of the Honor System and how it works
Fear of litigation from a student convicted of an honor offense.
The single sanction. No one but the most retributive S.O.B. would actually carry through to the single sanction on minor infractions. Thus fewer cases are reported or accused, and fewer cases end in a conviction. Essentially, the single sanction dials up the burden of proof.
Single sanction.

**Q E3: Do you have any suggestions for improving the Honor System?**

Clarify.
Data that it works.
I wish I did have suggestions to offer.
Communication.
I honestly don't know how it could be improved, but as a faculty for many years, as well as alum, I oppose any deviation from the single sanction system. I strongly support parallel faculty action within the structure of the course that empowers the faculty to fail a student from the course in the event of suspected cheating.
Penalties should be decided on a case-by-case basis.
Related to above, guidelines for how far to go (Google, etc.) to detect plagiarism on take-home exams.
Bring in students who really believe in it.
Trust is a two-way thing; we should not require that students pledge the Honor Code, because forcing them to say they abide by it shows them that we don't actually trust them. They should be informed of the Honor Code once at the beginning of their study here, and if they intentionally break the trust that we have here, then {EXPLETIVE}, we don't need them here, and we definitely don't need them getting a degree from here.
Lose the sophomoric arrogance of youth - learn from a real judicial system. No one is executed for speeding. The punishment must fit the crime. If it doesn't, strict adherence does not result, contradictory judgments do.
Remove the single sanction option.
Orientations about Honor System right in the beginning of Semester will help.
Eliminate the single sanction in favor of sanctions graduated by seriousness.
A graduated system of penalties.
Single sanction simply must go.
Dual sanction.
I'm not sure that the single sanction encourages faculty compliance. Failure in the course often seems to be a reasonable response and one more in keeping with the scale of the infraction. The American judicial system is built upon proportional punishments, and I don't see why UVa students couldn't handle that level of moral and social complexity.
Introduce minor penalties for minor offences. Don't trivialize the pledge by making it appear on every conceivable assignment. Make the sheer workload of initiating an honor report less intimidating. I've heard senior faculty say they just haven't got time to pursue honor violations because of all the red tape.
Change the single sanction policy to offer alternatives like a one semester suspension.
Enforce the Honor System as it now exists.

Q: E3

Make the trial process more one of fact-finding instead of adversarial confrontation. In the present form, the charged student finds advantage in obfuscating the facts.
I think involving students is a laudable goal. But there should be a professional staff that handles academic violations. This would allow for continuity, but also would help to restore a measure of professionalism to the system. Additionally, the single sanction is, in my opinion, wholly inappropriate for most honor violations. Suspension, with an indication on the record, plus community service would often seem to be a better sentence.
Train student and faculty mediators to facilitate discussions around offenses to develop possibilities of reconciliation.
Either remove the single sanction or remove the seriousness clause. It's useless in it's current state.
There should be tiered sanctions depending on the severity of the action. Statements from faculty/students involved need to be collected in a more rapid fashion. The unnecessarily long process puts a lot of stress on the accused student.
Total overhaul. Other milder punishment options. OVERHAUL-OTHER Milder PUNISHMENT OPTIONS
Repeal the single sanction.
Change single sanction.
Change the procedural process to allow responses from both sides until no new information is presented.
Get rid of single sanction find a way to ensure that students actually report honor violations.
I believe that a major review is needed to develop a new approach that students will embrace.
Remove single sanction
One / multiple semester suspension as an option.
Faculty should have the option of failing a student on an assignment or exam.
Abolishing it and replacing it with a system that is staffed by faculty.
Redefine honor so that it becomes honorable to be honest; or rather, so that honesty is the measure of honor.
Get rid of single sanction!
If the Honor System is not effective, and some faculty (as myself) do not know about it, faculty training would be necessary.
Allow convicted students an appeal.
More talk about its importance.
Impose a larger variety of sanctions.
Change the single sanction to a graded system of penalties.
Get rid of the single sanction for a more honest Honor System.
Move to multiple levels of sanctions.
Diversify sanctions. Take plagiarism more seriously.
Continue to provide educational opportunities about the system.
Include alcohol related behavior and assault among the honor offenses. Educate students about what constitutes plagiarism.
Acknowledge the fact that the faculty is not very supportive of the current system. When I lodged an honor case, I polled several others in my department. Not ONE had ever initiated an honor case despite having had students cheat in their classes.
Streamlining investigations and trials.
Start pushing HONOR as a code before the students arrive at the University.
Amend the single sanction-- though retain a limited set of penalties, e.g., a tiered-penalty system (in which faculty, if they are reporting, could recommend the penalty level they deem appropriate). In addition, I've been given to understand that students really don't take

Q: E3

responsibility for reporting offenses any longer. A realistic sense that this was a shared commitment would be most helpful.
It's pretty good.
Reform the single sanction into a more nuanced form (like Princeton).
Have the university publicly support the system more, and provide more education on it.
Restore a real concept of honor to replace a Dickensian legalism.
Need flexibility, but accountability, for alleged violations. Provide venue for confidential data collection on offenses.
Yes, as expressed several times in my answers here.
Eliminate single sanction.
Change the penalty, and give people two chances, minimum - for at least some of the lesser offenses. Properly punish a first offense, but do not expel or suspend indefinitely.
There needs to be more faculty involvement in stabilizing it, so that each generation does not undo the improvements of the last.
This info should be on the surface. You could also run something like a media campaign - say, publishing in the daily newspaper some ten quick facts about the Honor System every week - to draw people's attention to it.
A range of punishments to fit different crimes.
Design tests and exams so that casual cheating between neighbors cannot occur.
You should have the power to subpoena the student. In my recent case the student had his phone disconnected and did not respond to e-mails. That allowed him to evade the investigators for a semester. I was told that my case involved an uncooperative cheater. You ought to assume that somebody caught with his hand in the cookie jar is going to be uncooperative! Why would they cooperate, knowing that they are guilty?
Pay more attention to cases that are likely to happen, not just cases that have happened.
Get rid of single sanction.
Involve and educate the faculty.
Restore the non-toleration clause. Make cheating automatically a serious offence. Abolish random student juries. (A much smaller point: Honor Committee representatives - including the chair, {NAME} - should address faculty as Mr. / Ms. not by their first names).
Have honor charges only be allowed for extreme cases of honor violations. Tests / exams / papers, not on minor things like homework, or non-academic related issues.
Non-toleration clause.
Students should be required to report any instance of suspected cheating. Failure to report such activity should be an honor offense. Perhaps the single sanction should be modified to include a year's suspension.
The single sanction definitely needs to be eliminated and replaced with a graded series of penalties appropriate to the offenses.
Not having it.
Live up to your own proclaimed standards. If you can't do that, institute a dual sanction permitting short-term expulsion for less egregious cases. Be sure that faculty do NOT have to prosecute cases, merely act as external technical advisors. Commit to rapidly prosecute all cases, say within two weeks.
Abolish it.
More discussion about it.
Students should be proud of their student-run system.
Smaller scale penalties for smaller scale transgressions.
Make juries undergraduate only. If the defendant is a graduate student, then make the juries grad student only.
Educate us.



Q: E3

Remove single sanction.
Get the administration off its PC backside to tell faculty they signed a contract and are OBLIGATED to fully support the system. Second, if the Honor Committee won't insist that students who witness an Honor offense have an absolute, Honor-bound obligation to turn in their fellow students who lie, cheat, and steal, then the Honor System isn't worth preserving. Stop whining about the weak standards in society, and get about the job of changing them!
Regular communication with the faculty. For example, an Honor Committee member addressing every department in the University on a yearly basis would be good.
Abolish it.
Continue faculty support.
At least one faculty member on the committee.
Education to allow buy in.
Get faculty involved at some level.
More faculty involvement/ simplified process.
Institute a dual sanction.
Drop the single sanction. Go to a three-level system and build counseling / support into the picture. Stop attacking faculty in the trials. People just simply aren't going to subject themselves to this. After one experience, they'll never refer a case again.
Return it completely to student control. Only students should bring a violation forward for investigation.
First, eliminate the single sanction; it's a ridiculous tradition.
No free rides for anyone - always fair.
Students should take it more seriously, and should be rewired to report cases that they observe.
Anonymous annual semester stats - number of cases reported, number of trials, number of convictions, number of appeals (ouch!)
Let the punishment better fit the offense - college should be a time of nurtured growth and learning.
I wonder if the single sanction is somewhat like the death penalty: those responsible are reluctant to apply it.
Drafting a clear definition of Honor System offense, but with some relevance to contemporary technology.
The power of the above named culture should be redirected to genuine integrity, academic and personal. Minor violations must be taken much more seriously along the lines of a broken windows theory of policing.
Encourage stricter application
More education about the system and responsibilities.
Get rid of the single sanction.
Develop punishments that fit the offense.
You have to get the students to believe that personal responsibility is still a valid paradigm for life and then take it.
Reinstate the non-toleration clause. Eliminate the single sanction. Bring trained adults into the process.
Making public the cheater's name is a good punishment.
Develop an alternative to the single sanction. It's counterproductive. If professors were allowed to simply give a student a zero for the assignment and then turn it over to the Honor Committee to decide if further action was necessary, that would be a start.
Remove the single sanction. Allow for a range of sanctions. Clearly, some infractions are considered more serious than others. The law should be flexible enough to respond to real-life situations.
Give up the single sanction. It's an anachronism, a distortion of what student and faculty lives

are like. Disciplinary options need to be flexible. Allowing for probations or suspensions would assist in creating a culture of responsibility, which is important on so many levels to this university: academics, racial diversity and tolerance being paramount today.
Educate students.
Be clear on policies, fair and transparent on processes of investigation and prosecution.
Make expulsion a last resort. Perhaps the result of an honor offense conviction could be mandatory honor counseling and community service - anything that would reduce the burden of accusing a student with the knowledge that you may ruin their chance of graduating from college. Also: perhaps recognize that ideas about honor and cheating are culturally variable. From what some colleagues have told me, in many parts of Europe cheating is considered par for the course among students and faculty alike. This may mean that non-us students have more trouble adjusting to and internalizing the Honor System than do us students. Just a thought.
Redesign the system to reduce impact of above limitations.
Some sort of progressive punishment, like a two or three strike rule.
Most of the work I do with students does not relate to the Honor System. We write proposals jointly. We want them to get the opinions of many people so there is no such thing as cheating
In a very real sense, it is the UVa administration who is really at fault here. Whether the system works or not (and I think it does not), the administration gets to sidestep the whole issue of the extent of cheating, ways to detect cheating, and how to punish for honor offenses. Not their problem. But it is their university. This is two-faced.
Yes - publish transcripts of trials where the student is convicted.
I think that cases of how Honor Code issues are resolved and the required elements for faculty would be more effective than general PowerPoint presentations about the Honor System. I think that the faculty needs to think about how they would solve specific honor violations within the requirements for situations that they might encounter. I also think that students need similar education to understand the ramifications of negative choices associated with Honor Code violations.
Faculty members are hesitant to contact the Honor Committee with questions or comments. They are much more likely to talk with other faculty members. I suggest training faculty volunteers to act as an initial point of contact between a faculty member and the Honor Committee.
I would rather see efforts redirected toward organizations that support intellectual community, lend more support (and confidence in) student-athletes and their academic work, and organizations that confront and address historical and present racial inequality at the university. If the idea of the Honor System is to promote community and trust, it is not effective, particularly as it cannot confront or prosecute assault and hate crimes (the major sources of anxiety and mistrust) but only students who cheat on coursework - something I believe instructors are perfectly competent to handle through grading and course credit in their own classrooms.
More education for the TAs on the system itself.
Change single sanction option.
Increase awareness among faculty.
Multiple sanctions.
Multiple sanctions to deal with degrees of seriousness. Kicking someone out for cheating on a homework assignment is not the same as plagiarism. Single sanction also makes lying almost meaningless in the Honor System
Change the sanction.
I think it should be replaced with the expectation that we are adults now, and we left cheating behind us when we left high school. We have to live according to academic standards now (after all, I am not copying my colleagues articles, and I don't need a Honor Code for that). It's the real world now.

Q: E3

Get rid of the single sanction.
Fire the nonbelievers.
Make it more flexible with its punishments.
More action, less talk.
Do not expel students. The expulsion of students by the Honor Committee is shameful and an embarrassment to the university.
Reconsider single-sanction.
Better training.
More propagating. In the past, each classroom has honor pledge stuck on the wall. After renovation, many of them are gone.
Establish a range of sanctions.
Find a way to instill honor in students, and help instructors to identify students cheating.
Tutorial (web).
Abolish the single sanction, or apply a bottom-up reform of the single sanction such that can incorporate forgiveness and other methods of reducing the reluctance of students to find fellow students guilty on seriousness. Non-triviality makes as much sense of a reform as improving refrigeration in the arctic - what is non-triviality if not seriousness? Furthermore, many alcohol-related offenses must be treated as honor offenses because the consumption of alcohol by a minor is in fact lying; it is a misrepresentation of the individual's age. Given that such a serious alcohol problem exists at UVa, that students do not see the dangers imposed on self and others by gross alcoholic consumption or illegal alcoholic consumption as dishonorable reflects the inability of the Honor Committee to take seriously the threat to a community of trust, both trust in ones self and ones peers, to make smart decisions.
Change from single sanction. Look what Davidson college is doing.
Eliminate single sanction emphasize to students the positive aspects of being honorable, not just the negative of getting caught.
Reduce occasions that place undue stress on the system. Specifically, do away with take-home exams.
End single sanction return to requirement for student reporting of offenses provide limited liability policy for faculty against litigation.
I think it should be entirely revamped, with much more involvement (including in charging, decision-making, etc.) by faculty and / or administrators.
Unfettered, consistent, non-political reporting of violations - until the bulk of the student community is committed to reporting violations, this system cannot work.
Streamline, clarify process, and protect faculty time.
It should move towards some form of dual sanction.
Get rid of the single sanction once and for all! Apply it to all dishonorable behavior, such as sexual assault. To be honest, I'm not sure it works having it be student run - as heretical as that opinion may be.
Provide more (multiple, not just at beginning of entrance into UVa) orientation for international students (and other minority groups) that includes discussion of cultural differences and specific cases of violation (may already be done, but could be done more).
Devise a method for students to take cheating seriously - although for most of them I suspect it is a little late.
Abolition.
Either eliminate the single sanction or introduce some form of forgiveness provision.
Abolish single sanction. Make students responsible for pursuing violations that they know about.
Allow students who are guilty but the offense is deemed not serious to be suspended.
None since I have no real experience with it.
Almost all useful solutions seem politically impracticable. Doddering alumni identify the

Q: E3

Honor System at the core of their experience, despite large growth in numbers and diversity at the university, and despite large changes in ease of cheating due to growth of electronic media. You give students a veto over changes writ large with the referendum system, and a veto over case-by-case application with the jury system. The single sanction is seen as sacred, as is obtaining alcohol by underage students. So the only practicable suggestion that I can conjure up is for the materials presented to the students to discuss ownership of authorship. Apparently, no one ever tells them that copying huge sections from someone else's web page is plagiarism.
Students who fail to turn in an offender are as guilty as the offender (old standard).
I think it works well as is.
Replace the single sanction by, say, suspension of some duration for a first offense for offenses like cheating (but leave open the option of expulsion for a first offense for serious cases of assault and so forth).
Students need to have a fuller appreciation of the all-inclusive nature of honor. Many (most) of the students I deal with on a day-to-day basis do act honorably on a consistent basis (and not just in class). The trick is to get the rest of the students to buy into the system to an equal amount.
Multiple sanctions is the obvious one. That's been rejected enough times that I've grown weary of thinking of any other way of dealing with it.
Return to the system of making initiation the student's responsibility.
Allow a wider array of responses to honor violations.
Remove single sanction.
Allow for milder penalties than dismissal from the university.
Better communication and consideration of revamping the system into a two-sanction system.
Reform it; abolish single sanction and then be more public about it.
Not really sure here. Targeted refreshers would be good. For instance, at the outset of the survey, I had forgotten about lying, cheating, stealing domains.
Continuous information (e.g. once per semester).
Faculty must be encouraged to support the community of trust by giving the Honor System an opportunity to work. They must explain the importance of honor to their students, both in the context of UVa and in the real world thereafter.
Communication.
I believe faculty should have the option of opting out for their classes and running their classes according to their judgment and criteria.
Move increasingly to computer-based examinations.
The objectives and rules need to be readily available and known among faculty and students.
Not really. The continuation of eloquent, hortative presentations of the desirability of a community of trust is probably essential to maintaining it.
Faculty should have at least an equal role in day-to-day running of the system and in sitting in judgment on honor cases.
Reinstitute the no-toleration clause to reinforce the student responsibility for maintaining the community of trust. Streamline the process within the legal framework required. Conduct regular educational forums for students to whom our Honor Code is an unfamiliar concept so that they have a stronger understanding and buy-in to our way of life. Conduct regular educational forums for all students, especially 1st-year, so that these students are strongly indoctrinated with the concepts of the Honor System as a way of life from their very early days at the university. All acts of cheating should be considered serious.
Add sanctions other than expulsion.
Allow for variable consequences.
Instigate one or two other levels but keep it simple.

Q: E3

Much greater open discussion and debate, in addition to regularly giving students a chance to reform the system.
We used to have our representative present to the faculty. This has not happened for some time.
Dual sanction no administrative interference statute of limitations. No charges accepted after 48 hrs of a 4th year's final exams and all trial must be completed within either 90 or 120 days of charges. If student administration is not sufficient to run a speedy trial process, then clear the docket.
When there is an event such as the one in the large physics class several years ago, do not allow the faculty member to talk about the case non-stop to the media until the honor proceedings are over. The accused students were exposed before they were tried.
Adopt some middle ground sanction - especially for first offenders. This might help students report their peers.
Make it less cumbersome.
Why does the Honor System culminate in a trial? I think there should be an investigation into what happened, rather than an adversarial trial. Isn't the point for students to acknowledge what they did wrong, and to learn how not to do it again? How is a trial helping to make that possible? What do students actually learn from participating in a trial of their honor?
No. I recognize that its weakness is also its strength. I admire the system's zero tolerance policy on cheating.
Multiple sanctions.
Get some alumni to help in running the office.
It would be better if the honor institution were not so much a student club. Faculty need to know more about the system actually works and not view it as an instrument for punishment merely.
Multiple sanctions.
Unfortunately, it is the culture of the school that is the problem. I don't know how to change that.
Abolish single-sanction.
All the years I have been here, it has been controversial. Something isn't working.
More awareness among faculty as you are doing.
Maintain public awareness.
As it stands, no. The students have led discussions and have held votes on the single sanction - that's how things need to be handled if the system were to change as I support.
I think that the effort to increase awareness about it will help greatly.
Remove the single sanction. Work on the procedures to be sure that convictions or acquittals are fair and consistent.
Make it less time consuming to bring a case. Provide for options other than expulsion for less severe offenses.
Do away with the single sanction.
May need to adjust with newer generation students developing new learning habits. The newer generation students supposedly learn better as a team with discussions. Some of this may lead to the impression plagiarism.
No; I need to learn more about it. I'd be interested in alternatives to the single sanction, though I know none has succeeded in getting rid of it.
Ditch the single sanction and permit a lesser sanction for less serious offenses.
As much as I do not support this, the single sanction has to be dropped. Today's students do not seem comfortable with moral absolutes. It is unfortunate, as those who cheat cannot compete intellectually or emotionally with those who succeed on their own. What better reason for narrowing the criteria and simplifying the process? Don't lie, cheat or steal. Or you will have to leave.
Remove the single sanction.

Q: E3

Make it a part of graduate student orientation on the college and departmental level so new students to the university are clearly aware of this coveted institution.
I support the single sanction, but wonder if a dual sanction might increase the number of reported incidents and improve the community of trust.
There should be degrees of sanction.
Include the faculty and administration in running the system. End the single sanction.
Add a forgiveness clause to the single sanction. Or else end the single sanction.
Give faculty more autonomy in dealing with honor issues. Get rid of the single sanction.
Reinstate the previous rule that a student who knows of an honor offense and does not report it is also committing an honor offense.
I don't think any improvement can be made as long as the single sanction is the only punishment.
Multiple sanctions - with it cheating will be less tolerate
Not really. Besides dropping it?
New faculty training
Remove the single sanction. Be honest about what sort of cheating is worth bringing to the committee. Who wants to waste their time, like that poor graduate student in last semester's open trial? Those kids obviously cheated, but not seriously enough.
Remove single sanction.
It should be given greater flexibility in punishment.
Includes faculty representative in the Honor Committee
Make it more flexible to fit the offense.
If the system could be less adversarial and more mediation-based, perhaps more faculty members would use it.
Despite my reservations about undergraduate juries, I would not support the proposal to have honor members serve on juries. Perhaps there could be more deference to the faculty on the issue of seriousness. In the openly tried case last fall, I believe the jury determined that the response papers in question were simply not important enough to justify conviction. This could foreseeable send us down a slippery slope to permissiveness regarding minor cheating. Had I been the TA involved, this would have frustrated me greatly. I think the assignment involved was worth enough to make a third of a letter-grade difference in the final grade. That seems serious to me. I believe that the seriousness clause has merit, but the degree of discretion allowed juries is discouraging.
Remove the single sanction, and allow the committee to assess a broad range of penalties.
I'm very ambivalent about this Honor System. I don't think we need a system to ensure that people are not cheating. This is a code of conduct among students that they need to take this responsibility as members of the UVa community. Perhaps when educating students about the Honor System, it may help to tell me why this system is in place and that it's about being fair to all vs. emphasizing on the deterrence factor. Ask them to imagine that if they work really hard to get an A for a class but knowing that some people just cheat to get pass or even get an a for it, is it fair?
Just as I said before, maybe making the first offense a serious warning/probation, and the second offense the student gets booted from the university. It may cause more cases to be reported.
More options for penalties.
Proctored examinations! Take-homes that are supposedly time-limited and closed book, don't make a whole lot of sense to me.
Have a sliding scale of reprimands.
More carefully define cheating. Make certain that students understand what is against the code.
Tiered penalties.

Q: E3

Other types of penalties
Mainly, keep it about class-related ethics. Tests and papers, not drinking or recreational drug use. Students don't respect that, in my opinion.
Introduce other sanctions.
Make sure all TAs are sufficiently trained in the Honor Code before they begin teaching.
Improve dissemination of information about the system. Make each course include detailed information about the Honor System and how it applies in that class.
Vary the penalty level and make the process more efficient.
Make all honor trials open and transparent.
I know that single-sanction is appealing, but my impression is that it doesn't really work. A graduated system of punishments for minor offenses might help. Or eliminate the minor infractions caveat.
Add multiple sanctions.
Make it less harsh.
Get rid of the single sanction.
Restructure with faculty consultation. Remove the absolute expulsion consequence. Bring the Honor Code up to date with issues of assault, hate speech, and rape. It is deeply offensive that a student who is a rapist can stay in school and have a gag order placed on his victim when a student who cheats once is expelled. A little quit is needed: if we are going to have a mock judicial system, it needs to take seriously all offenses of what it is to be honorable. If it can't (and I don't think it can) then it needs to find a way to be more equitable. No gag orders. Punishments fit for the crime.
Levels of sanctioning based on severity of offense
The system should not be student run they system should not be single sanction because this discourages reporting of cheating
Training, similar to the IRB. Introduction as a new graduate student.
Remove single sanction, allow course failure, suspension.
I really think there needs to be more information given to graduate students.
Tighten the time frame on the process and ensure that the accused student is accountable to it.
End the single sanction in favor of a range of sanctions based on the offense. The system should promote learning and good conduct, not fear and punishment only.
Don't advertise it so much. The Honor System here seems to me as overemphasized common sense. The things the Honor Code forbids are obvious. Secondly, some of the steps used to show off this trust seems non-constructive. Who cares about unproctored tests and take-home exams? I don't care if some person wants to sit in the same room as me during a test. He / she can look at me throughout the entire class period if he / she desires to do so. It does not matter to me if don't cheat. And even if I do cheat, I would obviously be more apt to do it when a proctor is not around. Therefore, it seems to me that if this Honor Code is overemphasized, people will realize that they have better odds of cheating and not being caught. As a result, overemphasis of the Honor Code should increase the rate of cheating. I am not personally offended if my participation of exams are tightly refereed.
Amend the single sanction. Faculty and administration must usurp some of the functions of the Honor Committee in order to give the committee more professionalism.
It seems it would work more with more investment, but in my experience it is far superior to other universities.
All students have to believe that it is fair and just. If that requires reducing the penalty, then that may be a solution.
I've appreciated the automatic honor-code statement option on tool kit, and I think that was a good idea. I think if we all knew better how honor works and how to proceed with reporting offenses the code might seem clearer to the students and we would all apply it consistently

Q: E3

(however we felt about the severity of punishment).
Eliminate the single sanction. I'm sorry if you find that inconvenient.
Reminders, enforcement.
Reach out to graduate students more - they are the ones who are most likely to need socialization into our Honor System, since they came from schools without one or from schools with rampant cheating, but they are the ones who will be the primary enforcers of the Honor System in their classes.
Knowledge of Honor Code should be required of TAs. It was not mentioned in my TA preparation class.
Put something pleasurable into the system, need something to celebrate once in awhile.
Are alumni on honor juries? I wonder if alumni would be less biased in their judgments than are current students.
Get rid of single sanction.
Require witness offenses, either by students or teachers, to be reported.
Abolish the single sanction. Give faculty a greater role. I'd also note I think you should stop your attempts to eliminate juries. The idea is like putting allowing the prosecuting attorney to be the jury. I'd rather have the faculty judge than have that system. But you don't need to change it; eliminate your idiotic single sanction and the juries will work just fine.
Greater and more persistent communication of information to graduate instructors and TA's would certainly help
Faculty should have more involvement in the system & more support if they accuse a student.
Clarify how it works; figure out a better way to address complex cases.
I don't believe the students should be in control of the system.
Keep the single sanction and use it. Tell the administration and everyone else to bug off.
I think that there should be several levels of sanctions, so that faculty and students will be more likely to report even minor infractions.
Clearly defined expectations about what is, and what is not, cheating graduated punishment system faster investigation and trial periods.
I think that every student and faculty member should have to take an Honor System online course (PowerPoint program) before each academic year.
Modifying the single sanction.
The Honor System should not be single sanction. It should use expulsion in only the most serious of cases, and should consider lighter punishment for less serious offenses.
Two stage sanction with expulsion following suspension.
Add variety of sanctions, all of them serious. Having a booklet handed out at the same time as the sex information during 1st-year orientation. More discussion around grounds about honor in general and what it means to belong to a community of honor. There should be consideration of what it means to be honorable, not chiefly what it means to be dishonorable.
Eliminate single sanction.
Get rid of the single sanction. Apprise TAs early and often about their rights and responsibilities. Reduce use of the seriousness clause.
Make its presence more obvious by having (anonymous) updates about current refractions and trials---and communicating the outcomes.
Institute multiple sanctions so that students will confess and the burden of upholding the Honor System will not fall entirely on the faculty and teaching assistants.
Send out an e-mail once a semester (probably around midterm) to remind students and faculty how the Honor System works.
Assign a counselor to each person reporting an offense to provide guidance and information. Keep department/school out of process.
Most people in general do not know the guidelines or have forgotten this since first year. Try



Q: E3

to have brief mandatory presentations each year by RAs.
Unfortunately, if students do not think it is working, it will not work. It also must be perceived to be working fairly, but I don't know what might be considered fair by the students.
Place restrictions on faculty and administration members not directly involved in the process.
Get rid of the single sanction. Perhaps limit the potential honor reps at trials to undergraduates (at a trial I was involved in, my representative was a third year in his first trial; the defendant had a third year law student representing him. It didn't exactly seem to be a fair fight).
Change the all or nothing approach.
Provide an education and context for the value of honesty and ethics in the 21st century that is applicable to our very diverse student population.
Better education on the rules.
I would suggest instituting multiple sanctions and also better describing the place that graduate students and TAs occupy in the system.
Let the faculty deal with cheating on their own.
Maybe promote its benefits more.
Fix the problems.
Drop single sanction.
There ought to be a variety of appropriate punishments for varying offences, and faculty should be more involved in the proceedings.
It is imperative to educate the faculty members as to how they can help to make the Honor System more effective.
Install a multiple sanction system for honor offenses. Work to ease the process for faculty who initiate cases. Hold students accountable for initiating cases (which they would be more likely to do if there were multiple sanctions).
I suggest giving more information on the websites of the Honor Committees and e-mail updates of the Honor Code procedures.
More discussion among faculty.
A dual sanction could perhaps improve things.
Expand it to include things that, in the real world, people actually go to prison for...like rape.
More information and training sessions for faculty and graduate instructors to help them understand the process. Holding mock sessions that detail the process from a faculty report of an incident through the trial would also be helpful.
I teach in the clinical setting and I have reapplied the Honor Code there to include student honesty about illness (needing to miss clinical) and keeping faculty informed. Perhaps this could be made a formal part of the system? I know that attending class is not really required by attending clinical in our school is, and missing due to illness is understandable as long as it is true illness.
Eliminate the single sanction and put in its place a graduated set of punishments / disciplinary actions. Reinstate the non-toleration clause.
How do you instill honor into a generation that wasn't necessarily taught it?
Get rid of the single sanction.
Have different sanctions.
More than just a single sanction.
Abolish it.
Go to a graduated scale of sanctions dependent on the severity of the infractions.
Since the system is run by the students, the community of students has to accept the mantle of responsibility for the Honor System's functionality. In theory, the system works because the punishment is severe. Some would advocate a suspension option; however, in my view, that simply condones violations, implying that a willful violation of the Honor Code is acceptable if it happens once. This is unacceptable. In summary, these students have to

Q: E3

believe in the Honor System and the values it is designed to protect, or it is doomed to fail.
A more direct and concise description of the system on the website.
There could be more clarification about what constitutes cheating: for instance, I often have people go to the writing center for help on a paper, and then pledge that they haven't received help on this assignment. What about tutors in general? What about using tests from previous years to study? Someone else's notes from last year?
Make the system less punitive and less encumbered by the model of a criminal court, where the predominant concerns are to protect the innocent and punish the guilty. The whole thing should be on a different basis, one that is more educative, flexible, and humane. It is also wrong to assume that ethical conduct is primarily a matter of observing rules. This is a common enough assumption in our society but I don't think it adequately describes how people really are. People act morally not by following rules but by following models, models in others' actions, with this in mind, we should think far more about how we can model ethical conduct, disseminate helpful prototypes, and above all promote conduct that is good. (I have also mentioned in previous answers specific procedural changes that should be considered, like making it possible in one honor trial to introduce material from previous trials involving the same student.)
Introduce graduated punishments (no single-sanction).
I have not yet discovered how to have an effective Honor System at a large institution. There is no sense that a person can leave their bag at their carrel in the library without it getting stolen. If the Honor System were truly in effect, then students would live in a place without locks on the doors but we know that because we are so integrated into the community, that is impossible.
Involve faculty in the process.
Be stricter in application.
Make it more pragmatic. Lying and cheating can be very benign mistakes that don't reflect a lack of honor, especially in an 18 year-old living on his / her own for the first time. Our firm stance that petty mistakes by teenagers can or even should be punished by such a drastic sanction seems disingenuous, anachronistic, and ideological, rather than truly designed to enhance the university community.
Drop single sanction require diversity / sensitivity training for student members of the athletic department. To get in line with the academic rigor of UVa.
Get rid of the single sanction.
I am impressed with the manner in which the system is run. The students are a wonderful representation to the faculty of what should be.
Make information about it easier to find. I had to sign a pledge supporting it when I was hired, and when I wanted to find more information about it before signing the contract, it wasn't as easy as I would have liked.
Professionalize it by taking it out of the hands of students, and introduce proportionality of punishment into the sentencing scheme.
Perhaps graduated sanctions.
Consider moving away from the single sanction.
Have multiple sanctions, ranging from failing a course to suspension to expulsion.
Make criminal activities honors violations.
More education for faculty.
Let's start by asking for some faculty to participate in a series of small group discussions with student honor representatives. Make a general call for participation. I think that a few faculty will volunteer. Then let's see where that takes us
Get rid of it.
If necessary, change the system to diminish the university's exposure to litigation risk.
Have range of punishments for different infractions.
Allow the Honor Committee to issue sanctions based on the nature of the offense and the

Q: E3

student's past record rather than the single sanction.
Abolish the single sanction.
Emphasize faculty training and familiarity with the system.
Remove the single-sanction policy.
Increase communication by departments and schools.
Eliminate the single sanction.
I need to know better about the Honor System before I give suggestions.
I'm not sure I understand enough about the reasons for the single sanction. Certainly a harsh penalty makes it very real and helps with its general effectiveness, it also ensures trivial issues are not referred. But I can imagine situations when I'd like to hold the student publicly accountable, and while I can manage accountability with my grading, the single sanction seems too high a price for some instances.
Eliminate the single sanction.
If two answers are essentially identical - except for punctuation, or variable names, treat that as valid evidence. Stop being so afraid of the lawyers.
Remove single sanction clause.
More student workshops especially geared to how not to plagiarize.
Professors should not make it easy for students to cheat by giving same exams, multiple choice, etc.
Go back to the way that students are seen as violating the Honor Code when they fail to report or initiate a case against others.
Require faculty to report honor offenses before allowing them to fail a student for cheating.
Make mandatory to report a violation for professors to have the option of failing a suspect.
Too many to fit here I was part of the yearlong envisioning integrity group that just quietly fizzled away.
Remove the single sanction and provide for suspension. There should also be more faculty involvement.
Emphasis on student initiation of cases.
Reconsider the single sanction; let faculty be involved in oversight of the system.
Focus on the sectors of the student body - especially minority and international students - who have been charged in the highest percentages of cases, make the amount of paperwork and time investment on the part of the accuser minimal so that they don't regret initiating a case.
Get rid of the single sanction. At least give the student one warning before kicking them out of school.
Educate and clarify misconceptions.
Discourage faculty noninvolvement.
Students need to own the system...not just the dedicated few in believe in it but the whole student body.
Replace it with a graduated system of crimes / punishment run jointly by faculty and students.
Have the Honor Committee make a public statement that honor offenses, even in comparatively slight matters, are serious enough to warrant expulsion.
Get rid of single sanction but frankly the Honor System does not work very well and is a burden on the faculty because of the way trials are organized.
Abolish the single sanction once and for all, and stop tinkering at the edges with trial procedures, choices about juries, etc.
Either there has to be other punishments made available to the committee or they have to be willing to enforce policy more strongly. I would like to see expulsion remain as a punishment and have a space on the transcript that says that a student was found guilty of committing an honor offense.

Q: E3

Get rid of single sanction.
Awareness, awareness, awareness - my information at present is entirely through the print media.
Multiple sanctions. And try to encourage a culture where students report each other's misconduct.
Improved education and awareness.
As it now stands I do not see how it can improve. In my opinion, experienced administrators should be in charge of running the Honor System in order for it to be effective, fair and efficient.
No more web-based teaching sessions.
Develop multiple, appropriately graded sanctions. I thought that my students who cheated on an assignment should be suspended for a semester, then allowed to return.
Permanent dismissal from UVa is harsh, but I believe it is a deterrent.
Just keep the single sanction and enforce it.
It would help to provide more information to the faculty about our role in this process. While I am sure that the information is available, using proactive mechanisms to impart this information (i.e. e-mails, etc.) would be beneficial.
Have gradations of penalties, allowing warnings, grade penalties, suspensions, community service, etc. For first offenses / less severe offenses.
Should have more than one sanction.
Stricter enforcement.
Abolish the single sanction.
Abolish it.
Have proportionate sanctions, reserving expulsion for most egregious offenses.
Get rid of single sanction. Plagiarizing a paper from a friend on a low-level course is not an act that should get you barred forever. If anything, those cases should be treated with more leniencies, as many times there is still time to improve.
Drop the single sanction.
Anchor honor representatives in departments.
Cases must be addressed promptly.
Do away with writing the pledge. That is a complete joke.
Not really. It seems to work as well as might be expected. I don't see a way to lighten the load on faculty.
Eliminate the single sanction and overly technical or complex procedures and doctrines.
Address the proof issue. Try to get students to report one another more?
Model it on that of VCU.
Collect data. If every faculty member is asked at the end of every semester the following questions then you will have a much better idea of what's going on how many possible honor violations did you report and why? How many possible honor violations did you not report and why? If you make this an honest attempt then I think faculty will respond positively.
Active recruitment of students from all ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds not having the Honor Committee be so socially homogenous removing the single sanction more evaluative presentations to the community regarding honor offenses and verdicts.
Tiered sanctions, deposition for accuser - not to put the accuser on trial
Be more realistic about pressures, temptations etc. Have a more balanced system that addresses different levees of infringement. Make sure students are thoroughly informed.
Establish funding to subsidize faculty's time commitment in participating, both as reporters of incidents and advisors to committees.
Clear information on the Honor System to teaching assistants.
Positive public relations.

Q: E3

Yes - have administrators or faculty as the jurors rather than students (students will always be reluctant to severely sanction other students); have lesser penalties than expulsion, such as flunking the course, for those guilty of smaller offenses (e.g.. cheating on an assignment only worth 6%).
Try, for at least a period of 4-6 years a system of multiple sanctions. Compare the data and experience with the many years of single sanction. Then widely discuss and choose/vote on which system works better. The extreme reluctance of some honor co. Members (including alumni) to consider any alternatives suggests to me that they are not really confident in the system. Methinks they do protest too much! I believe all parties want a student run Honor System. The basic idea of student self-governance is robust. I expect our Honor System will revive and thrive with a change to multiple sanctions.
Get rid of single sanction.
Make assignments and exams where it would be impossible to teach. (i.e.. essays, no correct answer, highly technical).
Don't assume universal support.
Remove single sanction for lesser issues.
Do away with the single sanction.
Nothing that hasn't already been suggested.
No - I think the penalties should be serious. But it does cause problems.
Simplify the process and ensure that cheaters are punished appropriately to inspire faith in the system.
I cannot answer this question because I am on a leave of absence and have not started teaching at UVa.
Perhaps a sanction short of permanent expulsion.
I recommend an effort to obtain best practices from other Honor Systems at other universities.
I was on one honor trial and it seems like it took place long after the incident - the next school year. And the student wasn't notified of suspicions against him immediately or even soon after by the teaching assistant who accused him - it took several months. So it was a much larger burden on him to attempt to prove his innocence (assuming he was innocent) when in that case he would have little memory of it. So it was as he said, she said type thing. This is the big problem with the retraction idea! Accused people should be notified within 2-3 weeks, regardless, as a mandatory principle. Otherwise memories fade and how could person defend himself optimally. There should only be a limited retraction period.
Involve faculty.
Get rid of the "seriousness" stipulation and replace it with a no toleration policy for any unhonorable offense.
Get rid of the single sanction make it a bigger deal on campus.
Drop one sanction.
More intense communication with faculty emphasizing our role and various elements of the system.
I would like more clarity about what constitutes an honor infraction. As noted in my previous response, it's obvious to me that students do not think that lying to a professor to register for a class is an honor violation. There's also lots of confusion about how far the Honor System goes outside of class. Is a fake ID an honor infraction? Is lying on an application for a grocery store savings card an honor infraction?
Tiered system of punishment, especially for offenses, which cannot be resolved through grading (minor stealing, etc).
This is the responsibility of the students.
Distinguish more between cases. Don't rely just on people not to cheat and be nice. Not going to happen.
Greater awareness.

Q: E3

Workshops that the students take to give them a more defined idea of what is considered lying, cheating, and stealing.
Change single sanction to something more flexible.
More detailed information provided on the honor website (i.e., case studies or common honor offenses / excuses). Testing students on Honor Code knowledge.
Students who want to cheat will, under any circumstances, however today's students have not earned the blind trust handed to them by prior generations.
Mentoring the attorneys. Students should have to work as an apprentice to an older, more experienced student with the legal representation aspects of the trial system before being given cases of their own.
Expanding to consequences.
We need more training on the hospital side of the university.
Softening the single-sanction punishment may help increase the report-rate.
Perhaps make a video for undergrads to view, portraying a sample case with realistic conditions: the cheating student will generally lie, often convincingly, evidence can be very convincing and prove beyond a reasonable doubt but at the same time can never prove beyond any doubt.
Allow one strong warning and then dismiss student on second infraction. There may be significant uncertainty with a first offense - and leave one reluctant to dismiss a student. However, if same student show ups again with similar charges, one begins to feel that the chances of this happening are remote unless the student is actually guilty.
Possible web-based tutorial for all students and faculty.
Educate and inform the students the need for honor in education...because no other way can prevent cheating.
I haven't caught anyone cheating before so fortunately, I am not as familiar with the process as others.
Get rid of the single sanction!
In the past honor representatives have made presentations at faculty meetings at the beginning of the academic year. This is helpful, but they did not give presentations to the TAs, and most of the cheating occurs in the lower division courses taught by TAs. I think this is where the Honor Committee needs to enhance awareness.
Simple, non-time consuming way of informing faculty. Ten bullet points in an email, for example.
Streamline the process include some adult supervision.
Modify the single sanction.
I need to know its details before suggesting ways to improve it.
Somehow improve the above teacher perceptions! (maybe publicize case results more - without student names, if necessary).
It should be faculty driven: the course instructor should be able to recommend the penalty. If the student feels that the penalty is unfair should be able to appeal to a university faculty committee.
Perhaps have different penalties and not just expulsion.
Wider range of possible outcomes.
Report to all parties involved the outcomes of cases. Use lay, broad definitions of lying cheating and stealing.
Not really. Most students and faculty seem to support the system.
The seriousness clause is very problematic. I don't have a solution, but something needs to be done so that students who cheat are held responsible. The Honor Code at UVa is a model for other institutions, including local public schools. My experiences at these schools as a teacher leads me to believe that an Honor Code is difficult to enforce at all levels when verdicts are decided by students, especially when there are personal relationships between committee / jury members and the student in question.

Q: E3

More training classes and awareness programs.
Get rid of it.
Have better communications.
Better-trained jury members.
Maybe a gradation of penalties depending on the seriousness of the infraction.
Clarify materiality.
Make it more noticeable both in and out of the classroom.
Not yet, new to the university.
I think expulsion is the right course of action for those found guilty, however fellow students may be empathetic and not want to convict. Likewise, faculty may not want to jeopardize a student's future based on one instance. Lighter punishments or punishments that fit the degree of infraction may make actual convictions more regular, but allow the convicted student to make up for it.
More small group, personal interactions to educate and support faculty and students.
Add a parallel administration / faculty procedure.
Needs dissemination on graduate campuses (medical school, business, law).
Get rid of the single sanction. Provide effective counsel for all accused students, and place restrictions on the ability of rich / privileged students to make legal threats outside the Honor System.
Increase the awareness across the university...there should a link about it on the home page since it is a signature feature of the UVa community.
Make a broader array of sanctions possible increase the vision of honor and what are chargeable offenses under the Honor System.
Require all new faculty and adjunct faculty to go through a required course, much the same way you have to pass a test to be approved for a computing ID. I had to do the same thing to be trained in the standards of ethics to submit a research proposal to the institutional review board.
Make sure everyone knows they've already bought in to the system. Everyone is obligated to participate. There's no excuse for failure to report an honor violation.
Repeated reaffirmation of Honor System's importance and legacy within UVa community.
System of graded punishment.
Make it an honor offense to not report an honor offense.
Get rid of the single sanction.
I find the wording of the Honor Code inappropriate. In the academic (and business) worlds, collaboration amongst classmates and colleagues is essential to effective learning and productivity. However, the wording of the Honor Code insinuates that collaboration is inappropriate. While collaboration is not appropriate for an exam, I encourage my students to brainstorm and discuss issues with one another and others in the field because they will learn much more with these types of interactions than they would relying solely on their own ideas and understandings. I think the wording on the Honor Code should be changed to reflect the fact that, while ideas can be shared, the work product needs to be original and accomplished solely by the individual submitting the work.
Get rid of the single sanction.
I do like the ongoing references to tradition and legacy. Seems to be effective.
Training for faculty.
Less adversarial (less a legal model than an instructional model for first offenses, though I have no problem with dire consequences for repeat offenders.
Get rid of the single sanction - have a variety of sanctions. Republish that booklet on academic fraud.
More information to faculty and adjunct faculty.

Q: E3

Abolish single sanction. Require all proceedings to be completed in one month.
Allow a diversity of sanctions.
Some minor offense can cause minor punishment, such that students will be more aware of it.
The process rests heavily on the accuser, but the accuser is told that they are just there to give testimony and that others are leading the process. They're not.
A tiered sanction system.
Abolish single sanction and develop different levels of punishment. Try to make the trials more efficient. Include faculty members or administrators on the Honor Committee. Student self-governance is exhausting.
We have no control over what the student's level of honesty is. I just appreciate that there is a system in place should I ever need to access it.
Limit the opportunity for cheating....most students do it, because they have opportunity.
Scrap it entirely. At the very least study its effectiveness and authorize a wide range of penalties with an eye towards deterrence.
Try to streamline the process of honor trials and don't abandon the single sanction. It would seem a serious waste of time to faculty to bring an honor charge forward and go through a lengthy process if all that comes of it is an administrative slap on the wrist for the student. We might as well slap him on the wrist ourselves. And then even fewer incidents of cheating would be reported officially. I think the single sanction is crucial to the integrity of the Honor Code. Abandoning it basically sends the message that we more or less expect a student to violate the Honor Code while the existence of an Honor Code is founded upon the idea that lying, cheating, and stealing are actions which destroy a student's integrity to the extent that he or she can no longer be relied upon as a member of the university.
Only suspend students or fail them on the violation in question.
An interesting idea would be to keep records of convictions and acquittals to permit some sort of precedent setting. Thus, the juries are not so diverse in regard to the outcome. It makes consistency difficult when juries have no history to go on. But, on the other hand that can be a certain benefit to the system because it allows it to adapt to the current student body quickly.
Have a variety of punishments, require less of the faculty / TA's to put forth a complaint / incidence of cheating.
Do something about the single sanction policy.
I think the punishment should still be strong, but if there is a less harsh punishment for the first offense I think more people would report. If people make a mistake once, I could understand that, but when they already have a strike and make the mistake again, I think that is when you could take action to kick them out of UVa.
Offer seminars, brown bag events so students can informally ask questions and discuss.
I think the system is fine - it's the faculty's attitude that needs to change.
Limit it to academics.
More discussion with each departmental discipline.
Abolish it.
Multiple sanctions, based on the nature of the offense. Restore the non-toleration clause.
Educating TA's
Perhaps, more flexibility in sanctions.
More effective communication.
Make it more available to clinical faculty at the hospital.
Have a simpler process for smaller infractions, and have lighter punishments for them as well.
Seminars and training upon entering the university by students for students.
Inform all faculty members, even adjunct as to role of Honor System



Q: E3

I'm torn with the single sanction issue. I like the idea enforcing the seriousness of maintaining a community of trust but I'm worried that students don't report enough. Faculty don't even want to bring up charges - they much rather deal with the situation themselves. I think there has to be a compromise between seriousness and punishment that with increase reporting, i.e. one suspension?
I am not aware of sufficient details of the working of the Honor Committee to make any comments at this stage.
Give more education problem to publicize the system.
And I repeat: bring back the non-toleration clause.
More interactions between students and teachers in setting rules supported by the Honor System.
Have graduated sanctions.
Ultimately, it will only work if a large majority of the students believe that honor is important and are willing to act to remove offenders from the community. Perhaps emphasizing to applicants that this is a community of trust in which students who fail to behave honorably are likely to experience great embarrassment and have their careers damaged on takeoff will discourage liars, cheats, and thieves from coming here. Efforts to make it clear that this is a student system, that it is cool to be honorable, and that reporting offenders is a duty of community citizenship, might help. Having faculty members emphasize the importance of being honorable would help also, but some no doubt would hesitate out of fear that they would come across as 'uncoil' to the students.
Increase range of sanctions.
Introduce additional, less serious penalties.
Explain options and how it works.
Add a toleration clause to the Honor Code so that a student who fails to report an honor offense is as guilty as primary offender. Whenever someone is convicted there should, it should be publicized in such a way that students cannot fail to know that the system is working.
Different punishment for different violations!
Promote faith in system by administering it fairly and openly.
Yes, I would like to see it expanded to becoming part of a common culture at UVa that concerns honor and shared values and is associated with various levels of meetings among the various constituents of the university. If it remains just an instrument to control cheating, then I feel it presumes a common culture of values that we lack. To have the instrument we must first have the culture - so despite my lack of involvement, I would be more involved if the system were actually more imposing more demanding and more influential.
Focus on more important issues.
Reform single sanction.
Options for sanctions have school / department Honor System vet cases before they go to the university level - then have option of other possible sanctions.
I like the idea of training at departmental meetings.
Single sanction should be abandoned.
Increase training diversity issues and dealing with a diverse student body.
Serious, but lower level sanction for first time offenders.
Improved communication that appreciates the many demands on faculty time.
That it allows for faculty to pursue documentation proving students' reasons for absences.
Change single sanction to multiple, less draconian sanctions.
Moderate the ultimate penalty.
Directly faculty oversight and supervision the system.
Better faculty education regarding the Honor System. Consider the possibility of a second chance option.

Q: E3

Get rid of the single sanction and address the issues underlying cheating. Greek system files, faculty who use and reuse assignments, multiple choice exams, etc.
Drop the single sanction.
Get rid of the single sanction. Get faculty more involved in teaching students about research, as well as designing less cheatable assignments.
Improve the manner in which people report violations. Make it easier and remove the stigma of reporting.
Yes. Abolish it.
I feel that the athletics department allows cheating to occur. In turn, some students are taught that the Honor System has loopholes and therefore can be violated. This is no longer an isolated issue, because these violations of the Honor System are obvious to some students and ignored by others.
Consider more carefully the seriousness of an offense - I believe that rape is far more serious than cheating on a test. No single sanction.
Not really. Perhaps increased public presence. i.e., some report about honor violations in the course of a year. Give people the sense that there are actual offenders who are caught and disciplined accordingly.
Include behavior that is harmful to another person.
Offering alternatives to the single sanction - perhaps a probationary warning on the first offense.
Personally find out more about it.
Remove single sanction de-localize investigations into minor infractions, make them department based.
Consider multiple forms of punishment. Also make it clear and simple for someone to report an offense so that more people are able to properly report.
If cheating has been defined down by the system over the years, define it back up so I can worry less about my students doing it.
Survey and report impact of Honor System on alumni (years after graduation).
Be consistent, educate the faculty better.
Make it a one-step process for obvious cases
Not at just this moment. I'd have to think about it.
Reinstate a rule that forces the student knowledgeable of cheating to turn in the offender.
Change the single sanction policy.
Let the Honor Committee decide if a violation occurred, let the Honor Committee recommend punishment, let the instructor ultimately decide on the appropriate punishment.
Lower the single sanction - instead of expulsion use suspension, and fail the student for the class, but don't completely cut them off.
Simplify process for faculty, allow more discretion in application of penalties for students.
I would leave the single sanction. Continue to emphasize the community of trust.
Encourage students to stand behind the system in reporting the violations that they observe. Or, turn the system into something that is governed both by faculty and students and assure that faculty will have peer representation on any sort of judicial committee hearing cases of cheating.
Remove the single sanction for first time offenders.
Provide other alternative other than single sanction.
Abolish the single sanction policy.
Work with faculty to improve assessments so that there is less attention on memorization and more on application (which is difficult to copy). To do this class sizes would need to decrease or more teaching assistants hired.
Make it tough.
Remove single sanction, remove the more dramatic institutions as a way of avoiding big

cases, charge administrators with the responsibility of trying cases.
Get rid of the single sanction.
Stress the link between honor and succeeding in life. The recent fraud cases and the implementation of Sarbanes-Oxley act of 2002 should impress students that a code of honor must be cultivated and nurtured during one's life.
A serious sanction which is not dismissal of the student for minor cases. Making the process easier for the faculty bringing a student in front of the Honor Committee.
Reduce first-time penalty; offer more info on and easier access to honor council
Eliminate single sanction. Revamp procedural system.
Get rid of the single sanction.
More honorable students, less pressure.
Education.
Introduce other punishment options based on the severity of the offense.
Find ways to get students to initiate more cases. Having a student honor representative in each large class to coordinate honor education and the reporting of cases (independent of the professor and TAs) could improve the situation substantially, if implemented in the right way.
Allow for penalties as befitting the offense.
Offer a mandatory training for all new staff and graduate students.
Set up a system of punishments for each type of infraction and stick to it. Encourage honor in the student and not just in the class. Make the Honor System more prevalent in daily life, so that it becomes part of the university common vocabulary.
I give mainly pop quizzes and think papers on assigned reading so I think it is hard to cheat in my classes. In 35 years here I have never suspected any cheating.
It would be a good idea to follow up on this survey soon after March 15 with an email to faculty with very basic information on Honor System, esp. On points that many faculty did not understand correctly on the survey.
Abolish single sanction. Require all proceedings to be completed in one month.
More exposure of it for the faculty.
The Honor System, if operating effectively, will function as a silent current of ethical thought and behavior underlying the rigorous pursuit of fact and opinion in the arts and sciences.
Just make it clearer that honor violations can be reported.
Allow for sanctions that take into account the severity of the violation.
Among faculty, there is a sense that students feel they can get away with offenses that are too minor for conviction under the single sanction. It's like a death threat by someone who wouldn't kill a fly - how can you take it seriously?
I think the only thing you can do is encourage teachers and students to read about it, but unfortunately our time is already so filled with activity that it is a hard sell to ask someone to study the Honor System on top of other duties.
More formal training for junior faculty and faculty new to UVa.
Add flexibility.
Abolish.
It is hard to reconcile the harsh outcome of the single sanction with the general tolerance at the university with behavior that is even more unethical, illegal, discriminatory, or otherwise, just plain boorish. This tolerance skews the larger system of values that our culture believe in.
Make the punishment fit the crime.
Get rid of single-sanction, and increase faculty say in penalties and consequences of cheating and plagiarism.
There should be more than one penalty that can be used for a variety of offenses. A student who lifts an entire paper off of the paid-essay websites has committed a different kind of

offense than a student who forgets to cite a source for two lines of paraphrased text. And accused students (or their families) should not be allowed to hire attorneys to represent them. On the whole, the process should be as streamlined as possible for the poor saps who have to bring charges against someone.
Do a better job at informing faculty about the Honor System.
More organized, more efficient. Quick investigation, quick result.
More proactive education about what proper citation is, how the process of scholarly inquiry and education relies on using the work of other people. More than one sanction.
Revamp it.
I have no particular suggestions. But I very strongly support the Honor System. I am glad that such a system exist in UVa. It would be very helpful.
Multiple sanctions. Faculty and student panels. More faculty discretion.
Have different sanctions for different offenses.
I think clarity is needed in distinguishing levels of infractions, e.g.. whispering the correct answer to one's classmate during an exam vs. outright plagiarism on a final paper. Does anyone really think the former warrants permanent expulsion from UVa? (Especially given the fact that this may happen often in larger lecture classes.)
Consider offering a range of possible sanctions.
Get rid of the single sanction.
It's a great system. Perhaps raising awareness would be good. I support the system heavily but even I don't know all the details. Also, retain the single sanction. Finally, anything that can be simplified should be!
Nope. It's like speeding violations. Nobody wants to get caught, but everyone thinks they can get away with it.
Honor representative should give a short presentation at the beginning of each class.
More good press in Cavalier Daily about the Honor System and in the inside UVa.
More emphasis on the Honor System during the orientation. Get parents more informed of this system. Put more emphasis on the positive outcomes of this system rather than the negative consequences. Strengthen the mentoring relationship between the lower class and upper class students.
First and foremost, you need to make the students understand and believe in the system. Once that's accomplished, you have to make them feel a sense of ownership so that they take academic integrity seriously. The major problem is not reporting violations. The way to change that is to make the students understand that they're only hurting themselves by not reporting violations. This is a complicated issue and as member of a paid committee I'd be more inclined to give better advice.
First level of action-the school level. Appeal to the university level.
Involve the faculty more deeply.
Reduce class sizes.
Increased visibility.
It is a student run system, as it should be and so remain. Students do well to debate issues such as the single sanction. However, I wish they would also debate and understand better the concept of honorable behavior, why this is desirable, and the price, which must be paid to have such a system.
One year of Honor System exposure before a student can vote on a case.
Make sure that the punishments fit the crimes, so to speak. And, if sexual assault or rape in any form is not an Honor Code violation it should be!
When I was at Hampden-Sydney, all students were required to sign an honor pledge during the first years orientation week. This was signed in front of an honor court representative and your peers. This document was then placed in our dining hall as a reminder of the oath one had undertaken, and it remained there until our class graduated. I believe that UVa could do something similar even though there are more students. This would be a binding contract

between the student and the university. I also think there needs to be a strict enforcement of the rules; believe it or not, this will have a deterrent effect on student. It will also renew faith in the system with respect to the faculty.
Get rid of it.
Have some students be honor investigators who do the legwork in building the case...as opposed to putting all the burden on the faculty member...there should be more support / help for the faculty member.
Get rid of single sanction.
Making the information known and required of all new faculty and exciting faculty refreshers. Perhaps at the beginning of each school term.
Eliminate the system or at least the single sanction.
Other (good) schools with Honor Systems have the option of a one-year suspension (plus presumably something on the transcript) for academic cheating.
Consider multi-tier sanctions
Have already given these.
I am involved primarily with graduate students. It is not clear to me how thoroughly they know and understand the Honor System. Also, graduate students in the biomedical sciences are required to participate in small-group ethics classes - perhaps an Honor System discussion/presentation can be placed within this as well.
If the system were changed, responsibility for determining an honor offense would not lie with the instructor, and the university's handling of honor offenses could be more uniform. Get rid of the single sanction clause, and make it the responsibility of all university constituents to report any infraction, secure in the knowledge that, in doing so, they are not escorting a suspect from the university.
No. Its too late by the time the students get here to correct their moral compasses.
Extend the Honor System to include all faculty and administrators (both tenured, non-tenured, visiting, appointed, etc.). And hold all faculty and administrators accountable for violations (stealing, cheating, lying, etc). These violations are occurring not infrequently at UVa, and sadly they are committed by UVa faculty, visiting scientists / faculty and administrators (see the recent book the cheating culture for a general discussion of this current problem in our society). Sadly, UVa is not immune to this, and unfortunately failure to correct this situation is rooted at the top and trickles downwards.
It might be more effective to have a graded system of punishments that encourage more cases being brought forward.
Focus on the development of personal honor / integrity and the many advantages that it brings to individuals and groups. Eliminate or minimalist the influence of law students and the associated influence of courtroom procedures. Provide faculty with some reasonable sense of the possibility for redress when they think things have gone terribly wrong. Engage alumni in promoting the character-building, life-enhancing dimensions of personal honor.
Make sexual assault and using fake ids a violation. Make it a violation of the Honor Code if you do not turn in a fellow student that you know is cheating.
Spectrums of charges and decisions versus all or none.
Remove the single sanction. I think a mock trial experience in a workshop setting would be good. And it seems that making such participation an important component of the faculty's tenure and promotion dossier would encourage participation.
Graded sanctions.
Drop it.
I think if there was a wake-up call punishment more people would be inclined to report an offense. But, I know for me, I am not going to ruin a student's career for something short of blatant and horrible cheating. There is such a gray line between helping each other and cheating. There needs to be more options than removal from the university.
I would do away with it.

Q: E3

Publicize the rules every new semester.
Get rid of single sanction. Maybe have temporary suspension from the university for some cases. Get faculty or administrators to oversee the system -- why exactly does the system have to be run entirely by students?
Remove the single sanction. For most students, failing a class (and dealing with the consequences of failing a class) is bad enough. Or calling their parents like they were in grade school.
Education is always good; the more people know, and the more informed they are, the better can be their grasp of their own responsibilities.
Require all students to read the Honor Code rules etc. Before granting access to computer system, for example.
Decrease the burden on those pressing charges.
I have a concern regarding cultural differences...that is, if one's culture, it is dishonorable not to help a friend, and that has been one's perspective since birth, our system would seem to disadvantage (or emotionally strain) such a student by making no account of this.
Mostly I think we should be sure that the single sanction decision is the way we want to go.
Perhaps alleviating the absoluteness of the single sanction rule, although I am not entirely sure about the ins and outs of this rule as it stands.
Very slight moderation of the sanctions system.
I would need to know more about the Honor System. All I know is something isn't working. Students should take more pride in their work and themselves. There should be more respect for people and things in general. It is a privilege, not everyone is lucky enough to go to a university, especially this one. The experience, people, and grounds should not be taken for granted.
Make in addition to lying cheating ort stealing make it an honor offence to refrain from reporting those you know who lie cheat or steal those who do try to convince students of the importance of taking the system seriously and of sanctioning those who do violate the code, even if the sanction seems very serious given the nature of the violation
All faculty should be given training regarding the Honor System when they are hired and periodically thereafter. As an adjunct, I have never received any training or formal information regarding the system and how it works, and what it means to the university. I have looked at brochures and websites on my own.
Play it like it is.
Professionalize the entire process by mirroring the judicial systems of other universities. In other words, put the university's counsels and attorneys in charge of the system, at least as advocates and judges. Reduce the draconian single sanction.
During orientation there should be training for graduate assistants. I went to the information session in august but not many others did.
Yes. I would like to make sure that when a student reports another student the name of the reporter is completely anonymous. It is important to make sure that nobody will find out who was the reporter

**Q E4: Do you have suggestions for increasing faculty support of the Honor System?**

Increase awareness.
Figure out a way to have timely resolution.
Email information.
I suggest simply keep on bombarding the faculty with relevant information about the Honor System.
Communication.
Public demonstration of lack of tolerance to lying, cheating, stealing, and follow-through with

Q: E4

dismissal from the university. Reforming practices that hold the Honor Committee accountable for an expedient resolution.
Education (I am in the med school and do not teach a regular class so I am less familiar.
Other than course directors, most medical faculty do not deal directly with the system. There could be a better portal (web-based) for med faculty to access relevant aspects of the Honor System.
Yes, show that it is effective not a sham.
How about this idea? When a faculty member believes a student is cheating, the faculty member should be able to submit a file on that infraction, as well as take any actions within her / his class (e.g. fail the student, lower the student's grade, etc.). When the Honor Committee receives multiple complaints for the same student, they can then initiate a trial against the student. This way, the faculty member can tell the student, well, if this is your first offense, then you have nothing to worry about, but if you've done this before, then you clearly have not learned your lesson.
I assume the faculty is generally critical of the single sanction. I think they would be more supportive if the system showed greater maturity on the part of the students.
Increasing faculty support will help the Honor System more effective.
Eliminate the single sanction.
Students need to start reporting a respectable quantity of infractions. They want it to be their system, but as long as faculty report the bulk of academic honor cases, it is not.
More exposure of the faculty to the Honor Code, how to handle infractions.
Honor System has to work reliably and repeatable (same offense -> same punishment)
Make faculty feel that the system actually works. That they do have recourse when a student cheats and that they're supported by the university when they report cheating.
Faculty support will rise once the effectiveness of the system rises. I have never taught at or attended a school with an Honor Code, and I don't think the presence or absence of a code makes much of a difference to overall rates of cheating. I still take all the necessary precautions to prevent cheating (changing exams from year to year, monitoring for plagiarism) and do not expect students to take full responsibility for their own actions. In fact, I find that most students, while not intending to cheat, often engage in a number of questionable activities (re-using research from other classes, not citing sources properly), and that the proper way to deal with these issues is to teach about them directly, rather than expect the Honor Code to deal with it. Lastly, I think the time-consuming nature of the Honor System is a real detriment to its use, and unless the system becomes more streamlined, faculty are not likely to use it even if the rules are changed.
Reduce the hypocrisy that now exists, and enforce the Honor System.
Give us some real-life examples of how the Honor System plays out. Maybe I have only heard unusual horror stories from my colleagues.
A bit more advertising with pamphlets and website would help.
I think involving students is a laudable goal. But there should be a professional staff that handles academic violations. This would allow for continuity, but also would help to restore a measure of professionalism to the system. Additionally, the single sanction is, in my opinion, wholly inappropriate for most honor violations. Suspension, with an indication on the record, plus community service would often seem to be a better sentence.
Make it a viable system that can actually prevent (or punish) cheating, as described above. Faculty (including myself) will continue to not use the system until it will have some effect.
Improve the system.
Repeal the single sanction.
Clean it up or get rid of it! We're sick of waiting around for this hypocritical system to change.
Make the system work.
Stop the hypocrisy.
I don't have any suggestions, but I would do anything suggested to increase my support.

Q: E4

Train new faculty.
Information sessions for new faculty
More involvement - even if only as observers.
I like the idea of regular refresher courses, perhaps at regularly scheduled departmental meetings.
Make it work by not allowing some students to get away with cheating.
If it can be done, students should be encouraged to become involved in enforcing the Honor Code. It doesn't appear possible with a single sanction. But if a student sees cheating, and doesn't think it will mean the end of his/her colleague's academic life, then it is possible that more reporting might happen. The absence of student involvement is terrible.
Make it work. Faculty will support a system that effectively deters cheating and punishes offenders.
Speed up processing of cases, especially the time between an offense (often at the end of a term) and action.
Make it mandatory that a faculty member supports the Honor Systems if he / she desires to remain on the UVa faculty.
Greater respect for their input.
E-mail information to the faculty and TA's so they know the procedures.
Allowing overly legalistic interpretations of syllabi (both what's included and what is not) will almost surely undermine continued faculty support.
Ensure that all members of the university community have the same obligation to report violations.
Explain its basis and the reasoning behind it more.
I'm not sure that I really know how supportive faculty are in general of the Honor System.
Reform the single sanction into a more appropriate form (like Princeton).
Remove the guilty students and treat the faculty involved with respect.
I believe many faculty would be more willing to bring students up on charges if they knew that sanctions other than dismissal were possible.
Education.
Stronger support for faculty / instructors, more official options for reporting offenses without going through trial.
Give us power within it. A system where the faculty have responsibility but no power is doomed to failure.
Perhaps have an Honor Code committee session (open forum). For faculty who do not support the Honor System to voice their concerns. Perhaps that has already been done.
Lessen burden on them in trials.
Identify faculty who do not support it and have one-on-one discussions.
Faculty will support an Honor System if they really believe that it works. Their perception that the system is consistent and fear is most important.
Make faculty more aware of the procedures, and give them more say in how the process works. It is a little naive to believe that students can truly design a system by themselves that will adequately enforce and guard their own behavior.
Find faculty who want to be involved, and keep them involved. It won't be me, but there must be somebody.
Make the process more clear and accessible. We all are pressed with time.
More openness about how different verdicts are determined and on what basis.
Changing attitudes and policies to more realistically reflect today's academic environment.
Some universities have a code that includes the faculty in the community - UVa's doesn't. For example, Cal Tech's (I think) defines an honor offense as an act that takes unfair advantage of another member of the community. I think another issue that I have never been able to understand is how we go ballistic over cheating and then ignore much more



Q: E4

serious offenses against the community - like rape.
Have some easy ways for the faculty to remind the students about the Honor Code, in classes.
Maybe send out more regular emails about important info to faculty?
Get rid of single sanction.
Prove that the system works, and works quickly.
Only a meaningful commitment by students to uphold it would do that.
Actually toss out cheaters instead of making bogus justifications for cheating
Reform the Honor System by eliminating the single sanction and replacing it with a wide variety of possible penalties.
I wouldn't want faculty running it.
Make it work.
They need to be familiar with it.
Faculty are supportive.
If the students really enforce the Honor Code, the faculty will support it. As it stands, it is widely perceived to be a sham.
More education, faculty participation on committee.
See above. Faculty signed a contract and they have an obligation to support this system. Don't want to do it? There are 10,000 other colleges you can go to. Don't let the back door hit you on your way out.
More regular interactions between Honor Committee members and faculty.
Student lead departmental info sessions
Discussions about violations with anonymity.
Education
Make trials speedy and don't question faculty.
Most of the faculty with whom I've discussed this do support the Honor System concept! This is a very important fact. They typically do not cooperate with the present Honor System (specifically, by referring cheating cases to the Honor Committee) for reasons we have consistently stated dating back (to my knowledge) at least two decades. Faculty concerns, it seems, are never addressed and, as a result, people lose confidence in the possibility of reform. But they continue to support the system in class, explain why it works, demand pledged assignments, etc. There is still a basic foundation of good will with which the committee could work, if it wishes.
In this department, all faculty that I know fully support the Honor System. The fact that this question is on the survey suggests to me that the students want less and less responsibility for running their Honor System.
When students really care about honor and zealously guard it, then perhaps faculty will engage in the process.
Annual refresher that also demonstrates effectiveness of process.
Make the process less onerous and time consuming provide support for the prep work that is needed to bring a case to trial. Don't use my time (i.e. evening/weekend) for trials. Use UVa time
Strong, direct, compelling statements from students about the value of the system have impact.
Make faculty sign an honor statement at the beginning of each semester that they will observe the tenets of the code in their classes.
Faculty would better support a system that is less draconian.
Let us see that some results are obtained. Would you consider publishing data on numbers of cases investigated with a breakdown of percentages of various outcomes? My guess is that very few lead ultimately to a penalty.

Q: E4

Easier access for faculty to contact Honor System (for example, even web-based consultation and reporting?)
Reform is crucial, and strong acknowledgement from the administration and the students that academic integrity is a core value would help. In addition, the administration should promise faculty who bring honor complaints full support. No more cold-shouldering.
It feels as though there is an assumed baseline level of non-Honor Code supported activities. There needs to be more follow through to encourage use of the Honor Code and reporting offenses
Educate faculty.
Get rid of the single sanction avoid bizarre decisions.
When guilt is there, actually find the student guilty and act accordingly. Of the faculty I know that have filed honor charges, not one has actually gotten a conviction even when the evidence is patently clear that cheating occurred. In some cases it seems that the faculty members end up being condemned as having somehow created a situation where students could cheat by trying to trust them.
Nothing will happen until the students see the light and eliminate the single sanction. However, nothing happening is exactly what the students and alums want, so the current system, however dysfunctional, will exist in its current form in perpetuity.
Ensure to the faculty that the university will support them if they report a wealthy UVa donor's child.
Let faculty have a more active role allow faculty to be a part of the Honor Committee get rid of the single sanction.
None. The system as it stands disenfranchises most faculty after the first trial. My understanding is that, after the first experience with the system, most professors do not opt for a second.
Multiple sanctions, evidence that faculty voices matter, evidence that racial bias is not a factor.
Make clear to faculty what the legal implications are for their involvement with honor cases. Additionally, clarify to them what they cannot do in cases of cheating, or what disciplinary responses are out of bounds. Obviously, allowing for tiers of disciplinary action would bring on board many faculty suspicious or uncertain about the Honor System.
Mandatory training for all new faculty.
Educate faculty.
Emails, website information, reminders, information sessions.
Not sure. I think I'd like to see more diversity among the honor representatives and council members. It would probably increase my sense of confidence in its fairness if I knew that many different groups within the UVa student body were represented in the system.
Transparency, demonstrated effectiveness, team work
Like my colleagues, I do not have the time to investigate when I suspect plagiarism or cheating. When it is really egregious, I get mad and put some time into it. But UVA ought to have an administrative office (i.e.. outside the Honor Committee) to which faculty can report cases of cheating, especially in papers and essays. That office could then investigate the matter (and it will have much to investigate, given how readily the internet aids cheating). Once it finds sufficient grounds to suspect cheating, then that office can report back to the originating professor - who could then decide whether to proceed with an honor case. Introduce a second penalty: if guilty of plagiarism, a student fails that class and his / her name appears for two weeks in a banner ad in the Cavalier Daily.
Promote awareness of the Honor System and how the faculty can use it when necessary. This can be done through information sessions as described in the previous sections.
Provide feedback on cases. In my situation, the TA brought the case. I only get indirect information about the progress.
I think many faculty are concerned about single-sanction. I have yet to meet any faculty who support this system without ambivalence about its fairness and effectiveness.

Q: E4

Make knowledge of the Honor System mandatory.
Include faculty in the system. Have it apply to them.
Let faculty know what exactly is expected of them when they report an offense.
Encourage students to take responsibility for not tolerating cheating.
Inviting faculty to attend or watch tapes of trials to get a sense of the level of preparation both sides of an honor trial demonstrate. I was on a student jury as an undergrad and was impressed with the trial process itself.
Demonstrate evidence of student enforcement.
Get your act together.
More education.
Make them believe it functions fairly and quickly. Make sure the students on the Honor Committees are truly representative of the diversity we are working to build at UVa.
Yes - change to dual sanction.
Smooth process. Improve verdict speed and accuracy (too many false negatives).
Yes - stop evading responsibility and stop acting like the single sanction is the only viable alternative
No. I think it is well supported.
Abolish expulsion as a penalty.
Make it easier (from what I understand, faculty has to present quite a bit of evidence for anything to go to trial.) The time involved on the faculty's part seems to be excessive if they initiate an investigation that goes to trial.
More knowledge.
Get more communication with faculty members. Tell them how important Honor System is.
Establish a range of sanctions.
Yes. Proscribe several different VSOC's as lying / cheating.
Presentations to the faculty at meetings. One on one meetings with honor reps.
Make it work and support will increase.
Reform the system.
Depoliticize the process get students to report violations.
Discussion at faculty meeting.
Streamline, clarify process, protect faculty time.
Make sure that every case brought by a faculty member is handled promptly and efficiently. As faculty with direct involvement with the system appreciate that it works well, the word will spread. A faculty member with a bad experience will hurt the system more than ten with a good one.
Abandon the idea that it has to be student-run.
Require training on the Honor Code upon entering a position at the university
Apply it fairly - expel all cheaters and violators regardless of their contribution level to the university.
Change single sanction. Have students do more to own the system by initiating cases, rather than having a system in which faculty and TA's do the policing.
For an individual faculty member, the Honor System is a boon but pursuing cases is a losing proposition - a lot of work with no personal gain (and potential personal loss with lawsuits etc.)
Many faculty are distracted by other things and will not become actively engaged in the process.
Present case studies of prior honor trials and outcomes (with the parties involved suitably anonymized).
None since the type of medical graduate instruction provided does not fall under the typical classroom/examination approach that has been described in this survey.

Q: E4

Since the Honor System is a student run system, faculty will support the system to the extent that they see that the entire student body is also serious about the system. It isn't sufficient that a small core of honor representatives support the system, every student must take an active role in supporting the concept of honor.
Nope! And one other question, relating to a previous page: are faculty members themselves supposed to report students? I thought you were supposed to find another student to report them.
Get the students to support it and the faculty support will cease to be a major problem.
Many faculty who oppose the system think it is neither fair nor well run. This reflects opposition to the single sanction and concern that investigations are not conducted fairly. If faculty members see the system as well run and fair, they will support it.
Alter single sanction dramatically.
Remove single sanction.
Better communication of regulations.
The Honor Committee must continually reach out to faculty, educate them, and share news of Honor System successes. The committee must be prepared to address faculty concerns, skepticism, and cynicism. Nurturing the Honor System is a continuous process, as new students and faculty continually join the university.
Communication, student support.
They should be allowed critical input not just asked to conform.
Keep increasing its visibility among faculty members.
Not really. The longer faculty are here, the more likely they are to respect it, I think. I suppose the appointment of one trustworthy and co-operative senior and one similar junior faculty member as liaison officers for each department could possibly be useful, if increased faculty support is in fact a current goal.
I think it is a lost cause. Most of us are pretty cynical about it.
Conduct regular forums for faculty on the fundamentals of the Honor System, refresher sessions are necessary. Have an Honor Committee member, preferably, or deputized representative visit with every new faculty member soon after each semester begins. This could be a visit to groups of faculty, the smaller the better. Reduce the time for the process to be conducted. Money. Avoid a contentious atmosphere in which a faculty member feels that he / she is on trial.
I don't recall having an orientation to the Honor System as a new faculty member. This is probably the best time to get a faculty member's attention.
Make clear that faculty reports of cheating will be taken seriously.
Give faculty the option of failing or giving zero on a test. But then this has to be reported to Honor Committee for repeat offenses.
See previous question, and my answers.
Keep them informed.
Offer faculty who are accusing students some legal support just as the students' parents hire it for them.
Advertise that the system really does work and that students are indeed taking responsibility.
It might help if we received, each year, a summary (no names) of students who were convicted, what happened to them, and what their offenses were. I frankly have no idea if dozens or hundreds or instead one or two students are convicted each year. Are there really students who are kicked out months from graduation for a stupid and wrong, but not obviously egregious, minor violation, say help on a small assignment that they are supposed to do on their own? If I had a better sense of who gets kicked out for what, I would feel more comfortable with the whole thing. I should say that if hardly anyone is ever kicked out, that would be a shame, and would make the system much less admirable than it is. I like the idea that we take cheating seriously, and that students are dismissed for it, even for one offense (as long as it is serious). But I have no idea who is really kicked out, how often, etc.

Q: E4

As a result, I don't know how to connect the theory of the system with the reality of how it works.
Enforce the single sanction honestly, or do away with it
Shorten the duration of the whole investigation / trial / appeal process. Disseminate more info about the use of evidence and the kind of evidence needed.
Not unless we are willing to change the premise that students alone run it.
Yes. Find guilty students guilty. Faculty will eventually come back into the fold.
Give us a wider range of options
This survey might help if it identified reasons why faculty do not support the system.
More information and training about our role in it.
Awareness.
Again, I think faculty see the world as being more complex and less black-and-white as our students. I have seen many complex cases of student problems in 20 years of teaching. Most faculty find the system noble, naive and ultimately unsatisfactory. But the system belongs to the students.
I feel information sharing that provides clear demarcations as to what the system does and doesn't do will be very helpful in generating/regenerating support.
Faculty need to believe that the outcome of reporting an offense would be worth the time and the conflict.
Make it less time consuming.
Streamline the process for reporting offenses.
We should know more about it.
It will always be difficult to sustain faculty support unless members of the faculty see the Honor System as having a concrete and constructive influence on students' conduct on a day-to-day basis.
A workshop during orientation for all first time faculty members, especially adjuncts who may not attend all the beginning of semester faculty meetings.
If the students show leadership and commitment, the faculty would support this.
Remove the single sanction. For most students, failing a class (and dealing with the consequences of failing a class) is bad enough. Or calling their parents like they were in grade school.
Presumably more education; I don't believe most faculty are aware of the power they wield over grades with or without the Honor System.
Include faculty in running the system. End the single sanction.
Add a forgiveness clause to the single sanction. Or else end the single sanction.
Demonstrate over the next several years that an *all student run* Honor System works and that participation in the Honor System is not just a mechanism for pompous, self-important pre-law students to show off in a mock court room setting.
Show that you are serious by making it work.
More information.
Multiple sanctions.
Be honest with us. What cases are worth reporting? If you tell us all, then you're wasting our time.
Remove single sanction.
Again, make the process quicker and less adversarial. With such a high penalty, the stakes are extraordinarily high for students. Thus they have an incentive to fight for as long as possible. While I support the one-penalty rule, I believe that it encourages animus, not reconciliation.
Give us faith that we can actually get a conviction.
I'm not sure what does it mean by support - do you mean like taking action? Reporting

Q: E4

students or something else? Ideologically, this is a good system but whether it's effective or not is another issue.
I think most support the idea that an Honor System exists.
I think there is enough support, I just think that people having reservations is the biggest problem. I think once you can ease the pressure, everyone will be more enthusiastic about the system.
Make the punishments more reasonable. Granted, every student should know that cheating is unacceptable, but an F and a probation period for a first offense (kids make mistakes) may encourage a more active enforcement by the faculty.
Improving the system will, in itself, help.
It's hard. I don't think many people have a lot of faith in the system.
From my experience, I think that they largely resist the single sanction.
More discussion between faculty and TAs and the Honor Committee. Need to feel supported if we choose to initiate an honor charge.
I think they do support it a great deal.
Bring them on board as advisors, but still let the students run the show.
This kind of survey is a great idea. I received an honor brochure in the past but frankly I never really had the chance to look at it. It would be ideal if learning about the Honor System was mandatory part for the faculty and TAs before they start to teach.
Have the administration support faculty members that bring cases.
Make faculty members better aware of what constitutes an Honor System violation and the process of reporting a violation.
Make it less harsh.
Levels of sanctioning.
Faculty would likely support the system more if they felt their grievances were effectively dealt with. I would say this should be a focus for improving the system.
Get rid of single sanction.
Engage faculty directly in meetings about their views at a school-by-school level, which I think is already being done, at least at some level.
Faculty currently believe that the Honor System does not prevent cheating; it just prevents cheaters from getting in trouble. The single sanction means, in most cases, no sanction at all. Faculty would support the Honor System if they believed that it provided a disincentive to cheat combined with reasonable sanctions for those who do cheat. For example, failing the course seems like a serious sanction that would give faculty more of a stake in the Honor System.
I don't think anything time consuming is a good idea, but as a TA we were orientated on it and that was a good idea.
Faculty also have to believe it is fair.
I have conscientious peers who object to the severity of punishment or the difficulty they have had reporting or pursuing honor prosecutions. Part of their frustration may or may not be due to a feeling that they don't have a voice in the way things are run. I should stress that I have never brought a case before the Honor Committee, so my experience is limited.
Make a decision and maybe stick with it instead of the constant analysis and reanalysis and reanalysis. No one takes you seriously because it's plain to see you don't take yourselves seriously. For example: some faculty state even if you are found not guilty by the Honor Committee and I think you are guilty beyond a reasonable doubt I will fail you. If you did that to me, we'd be in court not having a chat with the Honor Committee. And guess what....you'd lose. So to my way of thinking the UVA Honor Committee is a legal liability that's eventually going to come back and bite you because you guys clearly can't make up your minds about anything. And when it's demonstrated to a jury that you have no clear-cut standard, despite all your rhetoric, your going to get sued.
More thorough work by advisors during cases, and more outreach, through professional

Q: E4

educators or an email / flyer campaign, letting faculty know in plain language what their options are and who they can turn to in the system.
Just choosing and publishing one of the various honor statements on a syllabus with my name behind it made me more supportive - it is really quite uplifting to put your name to such an honorable statement. Makes you feel good about yourself!
Show any statistics that make the point of how other students respond when they see one of their classmates dismissed from UVa for cheating.
I'm entirely ignorant of what support already exists.
Encourage more professors to trust students to take exams unproctored. I've never had a problem with that and it's a very nice vote of trust and a way to treat our students like the adults they are.
Increase the role of the advisory committee to one more integral to the process. Have a faculty member on the board of visitors. Faculty need more regular updates and education about the process and procedures.
Maybe publish success cases on the website, minus personal information.
Be consistent. Don't waste faculty time. {NAME} academic life stopped due to time commitments to honor trials once he blew the whistle on some violations. This demonstration didn't endear the Honor Committee procedures to faculty.
Give faculty a competent 'lawyer' for each case, who is not a student and can advise the faculty member and run interference with the Honor Committee.
Perhaps they should be asked / made to sign a pledge to uphold the Honor System. I believe we did that at Washington and Lee, which has a similar system.
Education.
Make the faculty comfortable reporting honor infractions.
The best faculty often come to UVa following success at another institution. The only problem with that is they are often used to an environment very different from the community of trust. Faculty may find themselves learning honor on the fly, no matter how sensitively they attend to publish materials detailing the Honor Code, reporting procedures, court procedures, etc. Often, in other words, it's not that faculty do not support honor; it's more that they want to act in keeping with honor policies, but are not 100% sure as to what to do in particular situations (as with make-up tests, for example).
Better publicity about the effectiveness of the system. Faster investigations, the holding of I-panel hearings, and carrying out of trials following the report of an alleged infraction. Including criminal and civil lawbreaking activity as honor offenses, e.g., sexual assault, public drunkenness, assault. These kinds of actions attempt to steal people's dignity.
If single sanction were eliminated and the process were less tedious for faculty, more might use it.
Actively solicit the opinion of faculty and then ask them to be more actively involved in the implementation. Don't just expect them to support it without giving them the opportunity to critique and modify it. It should be updated on an ongoing basis to be most effective.
Multiple sanctions.
Keep them informed of new pieces (ex: web page) and send them reminder e-mails.
Encourage members to support each other with assistance and information.
I suspect faculty support would increase if the system became more elaborate with more options other than expulsion. Changes of that type would also complicate the system and make administration even more opaque and perhaps undermine the perception of fairness.
Convince the faculty that the system is effective. Many faculty either do not trust the system to punish the guilty, do not want to deal with the backlash, or do not want to see a student expelled for what they may consider a minor infraction.
My guess is that most faculty members are of the opinion that for most instances of cheating, either the cost of initiating a case (the time and energy involved) is not worth it because of the overwhelming likelihood that the student will be acquitted, or they don't think the offense, even if they're certain that it took place, warrants the student getting expelled from school.

Q: E4

Get rid of the single sanction and you'll solve both problems. Juries will be more likely to convict and impose a punishment that fits the crime and as a result, faculty will be more likely to initiate cases when they observe cheating.
Use the faculty with the strongest ties to the Honor System - those who are long-term faculty and alumni also. To present orientation to new faculty on the value of the system to us as teachers.
Get rid of the bulkiness of the process and give them back the power to deal with cheaters themselves.
More communication about the benefits of the system.
Talk about the Honor System at department meetings yearly.
Let the faculty members know that they will not be burden with honor violation cases. The faculty members, who have identified students violating the Honor System, have regretted ever becoming involved. The Honor Committee needs to find out why faculty members think that way.
If the has is changed in ways to make it more fair, it will stand a better chance of winning the support of the faculty.
Not really. Keep up suggesting that the system be discussed during courses and advising. Remind department chairs to encourage their faculty to respect the values and the system.
Have faculty representation from every school on the faculty advisory committee, and work with faculty representatives to improve communications with faculty in each of the schools.
I think faculty support is strong.
Keep us involved and, especially, well informed.
Faculty don't really have any real options as the system stands now. I might be wrong, but I think that a teacher is actually guilty of an honor offense if she or he fails to report cheating when she/he is aware of it. But as I said before, single sanction is also often not a good alternative. So, I think there would be more support, especially from TAs - who are the ones who actually have contact with students - if there were more than one option available for dealing with cheating. As it is now, I would be more likely just to fail a student than report them to the Honor Committee.
More training and information. Also, maybe holding a series of meetings with faculty members to allow them to voice concerns, make suggestions, ask questions, etc.
I think educating faculty about the system is a good idea.
Faculty will give greater support to the Honor System when they see students taking responsibility for their own behavior (by not violating the Honor Code) and for the reporting of fellow students' honor infractions. Better, conveniently available information for faculty about the Honor System.
Increase awareness.
The faculty, I believe, does not support the system, because it does not work well. To make it work, you have to get rid of the single sanction.
Have different sanctions.
More than just a single sanction.
Have faculty as judges.
This implies there is little support from faculty.
I think I've made my feelings clear in the answers above. Any perceived lack of faculty support stems from inadequate student support for punishment. If punishment is not meted out appropriately, faculty will inevitably find their own way of managing violations internally.
Perhaps a few, succinct emails.
There are frequently cases where cheating is suspected, but it can be very hard to find any proof. I think most faculty feel that students get away with a lot of cheating. Are there ways to build in safeguards without looking like the Gestapo? (For instance, turning in papers to a clearing house which checks against all web materials and all previously submitted papers for cheating).



Q: E4

Improve the Honor System itself and faculty support will follow.
Insert training into dept meetings and school-level faculty meetings. The Honor System should get as much attention as the EOP and harassment training initiatives that are currently going on.
Produce more guilty verdicts.
The procedures for reporting a violation should be discussed with TA's by the professor at the very beginning, whether they've heard it all or not. Faculty members should be reminded to do this.
You need to gain credibility.
Create an infraction system that leads to removal from the university after two or three offenses
Get rid of the single sanction.
The truth of the matter is that few faculty are interested until something goes wrong. As a result, faculty are not informed about the process until they need the information at the time of an infraction. I believe that having department chairmen show their solidarity and promote the Honor System in their own faculty meetings will begin to set the foundation more sure.
Increase the student support.
I've heard from more than one new faculty member that they are annoyed by being tricked into the dinner sponsored by the Honor Committee after the reception at the president's house. I would have gone, myself, if I hadn't had a scheduling conflict. The general impression I've gotten from others is that it seemed kind of like an indoctrination or brainwashing session (maybe that's a little strong, but...). My suggestion: be transparent about what the dinner is, explain why it would be good for faculty to attend beforehand. Also, I'd like to know what students at large think about the Honor System. Do they support it? Why?
Faculty members are reluctant to devote much time to matters other than teaching and research. It would be better to publicize a simple set of rules without taking up much time.
If the system had multiple sanctions, more faculty would report suspected cases, enforcement would rise, and, I suspect, cheating would decrease. When the death penalty is prescribed for shoplifting, you're going to have lots of shoplifting because most shopkeepers will be reluctant to call the police.
Emphasize it for medical faculty - we live in a separate world.
By the way, the questions about my race on the next page are offensive and way out of line!
Win convictions in cheating cases. Support the faculty's right to assign grades independent of outcomes in honor proceedings. Curtail the rosy, smug claims by spokespersons for the university about the effectiveness of the Honor System.
Abolish the single sanction; faculty support will follow.
Hold more information sessions.
Eliminate the single sanction. Then come around and see the faculty again.
Please help us familiarize the system. It can be included in the new faculty orientation and regularly dispatching the Honor Committee member to attend the departmental faculty meeting by giving a short introduction of the Honor System. EOP office has been doing that successfully.
More communication.
Eliminate the single sanction. Make the investigative process less adversarial for faculty who initiate cases.
Convict somebody every now and then.
Simplifying the trial process - often arduous, demeaning and insulting to the faculty member.
Educate more, have more open discussions, so they can vent their frustrations and get accurate information.
Allowing for more than one sanction, faculty would be more inclined to report offenses with lesser evidence and believe a conviction with occur.

Q: E4

Make the process more transparent and divulge the statistics of trial results.
More faculty input especially in cases involving cheating.
Administrative support for faculty who do initiate cases.
Make the process easier for faculty members. If it is very difficult and time consuming to initiate a case, they will be less likely to support the system.
Make it as simple as possible. Put a link for reporting in toolkit for each course.
Faculty need to know that the system works because they do not trust it to work.
Not as it is currently run.
Stop thinking its working when its not.
Ditto--eliminate the single sanction.
Professionalize the administration. Make it less a notch on the resume.
Increase the perception that the system is working correctly to dissuade cheating and guilty parties are found guilty.
Representatives at faculty meetings for informational sessions. Web-based information session.
More information on how many cases are reported, and how many result in a guilty verdict. I hear only about the very few public cases and get the feeling that there are very few cases reported.
Improved education and awareness.
Provide more information and show the Honor Committee is readily available.
Require teachers / faculty / TAs to take a course - web-based or otherwise.
The university must make the strategic decision to show faculty that they will support them in honor cases.
I may be wrong, but my sense is that adopting the suggestions above would dramatically increase faculty support. Every colleague I've ever spoken to about the Honor System has agreed with this.
Stricter enforcement.
Abolish the single sanction.
Abolish it.
Nope. Don't make us email you to tell us we're done, there should be a field in this survey.
Drop the single sanction.
Removing the single sanction and less adversarial procedures.
Remove the strange discrepancy whereby graduate students as teachers (i.e. adjunct faculty) can be held to account as students within the workings of the Honor System, whereas assistants, associates and full professors are outside the sanctioning system. It seems to me that the solution is to treat grad. Students as students when they are performing in student roles, and as faculty when they are performing in faculty roles. But this is tied to a problem that is much bigger than the Honor System, and which may be beyond the capacity of the Honor System to address.
No, I can't imagine most faculty members caring under any circumstances.
We want help proving when students cheat, and also with setting up use of Honor Code in our classrooms.
Listen to them.
Train them.
Visit departmental faculty meeting on a regular basis (every other year at the beginning of a semester). Explain advantages of system to the faculty.
Ask for it.
Yes - make it worth the time to go through the effort. When the students are charged as guilty, but there is no penalty because the infraction was deemed to be a small percentage of the grade, it is not worth the time to go through the process to get such a result. In such a

Q: E4

case, it is better for the faculty to deal with the problem themselves. Have the jury consist of non-students.
Increase faculty education.
Take seriously the ideas put forward by Arts and Sciences faculty about the system. A committee of Arts and Science faculty studied the system and put forth several suggestions about a year ago. I have not heard any response to those ideas from students.
Make it easier for instructors to report cheating and not a painful ordeal. Reporting an offence should not translate to instructors losing their time and energy. Interviewing should be contacted at instructor's office.
Make faculty feel like if they take the time / trouble to report a violation, that something will actually come of it.
Abolish it and replace it with something more in line with the policies of other universities.
I cannot answer this question because I am on a leave of absence and have not started teaching at UVa.
Increased communication with faculty. This is a good start.
Faculty need to feel that their reporting of an incident will be acted upon quickly and that everyone involved will be treated with dignity.
Involve faculty in the decision process and trials.
Make it clearer.
Get rid of the single sanction.
More sensitization of the faculty through informational sessions is necessary.
Drop one sanction.
Teaching suggestions (I give graded assignments that are nearly cheat-proof). Continued reminders through faculty meetings, web site, newsletters, and direct mailings.
A regular but shorter version of a survey such as this one would be one way to increase support. I would suggest, however, that you eliminate these irritating little boxes with a long scroll. It's very difficult to edit in such a system!
A TA (if responsible) has to be able to make the decision himself if he suspects someone. Asking, calling, emailing takes too long.
Possibly greater involvement of the faculty member reporting the violation in the penalty phase.
Anonymous surveys to students, in which they could be asked whether they feel that they or someone they know, may have at some point committed some act that could possibly be considered a violation of the Honor Code. I think the mere statistics of the number of student sure or unsure that the Honor Code has been broken, would give faculty a better idea of the dishonesty that could occur in their classroom.
Hire a higher percentage of professors born in the 18th and 19th centuries.
Require less physical involvement of faculty in the process. Improve faculty legal protection and support.
Good luck.
In my experience, faculty members find the Honor System a complete and total waste of time, even laughable.
Honor trials that are more considerate of the faculty, who are trying to support a student-run process voluntarily.
Faculty are sometimes concerned about the image that will be portrayed if they have to dismiss several students from their program of study.
A summary of the cases at the end of each year would probably help. I think most faculty feel it's a waste of time to report cheating because the student will probably be found not guilty. Evidence to the contrary might give them more hope.
Introduction to the system during orientation.
If it does take a lot of time to go to trials, etc., perhaps this could be shortened somehow. Also, I think if it wasn't zero tolerance faculty might be willing to call a student out on

Q: E4

something. This way, the student knows that faculty will call them out on it and be scared to cheat again. However, the faculty members won't be too empathetic to charge the student the first time knowing he / she would be kicked out of school!
Also, make the process less onerous on the initiator (this would probably be a less onerous process if the punishment wasn't so drastic).
The message - and procedures - need to be repeated at the beginning of every academic year. Faculty have a lot of things rattling around in their minds and refresher sessions are necessary. Also, it seems that the modifications in the system are not always communicated effectively to the faculty.
This questionnaire itself is helpful.
My preference now is to just give the student a 0 for the assignment - it's quick and effective.
Modify the single sanction.
Inform us, train us, and listen to our inquiries.
Change it.
Better acquaintance with it as it applies to graduate and professional school students.
Have them get involved in some sort of training.
Wider range of possible outcomes.
Information by email with links to your site.
Continue to have faculty advisory committees.
More options than the single sanction.
Make the process less cumbersome.
I believe faculty support and use the Honor System.
I believe most faculty support the Honor System wholeheartedly. I believe they need advertising from the honor council to promote the use of it and the need for it.
Include a faculty member on the court as a judge.
I don't know what it would take. Some vehicle to really get professors thinking about the greater societal consequences of ignoring honor offenses. Something that would convince faculty of the fairness of the system in general. But we are bombarded with e-mail and mail. I don't think these are the vehicles to use. Perhaps some academic colloquium that addresses the question of honor as a historical or societal concept - I have no idea, really.
Do a better job.
Increase awareness of responsibility.
Clearer communication about the process would help. I think most faculty only have a fuzzy idea about the Honor System, and it's hard to support something very strongly if you don't know what it is in the first place.
Giving faculty more options about how individual cases should be handled.
Allowing faculty/TA's to report possible violations without a lot of evidence. Having punishments other than expulsion - such as university / community service until graduation (maybe after graduation as well, having them provide documentation that they're volunteering in their community. Kind of like probation) there should be a hierarchy of punishments.
Show them the admission application, which (at least used to) stipulate acceptance of the terms of the Honor Code as a condition of attendance.
In-service training and repetitive discussion about Honor System's significance to UVa community.
Don't make it choice between a personal reprimand and ending the student's academic career.
Communicate that it doesn't have to take a lot of time to participate in a case. It's hard to extract the professor from the emotional impact of knowing that it's his or her initiation and testimony that lead to such a significant outcome (expulsion).
After reading the questions on your survey, it is clear that I do not know that much about the

Q: E4

consequences of Honor Code violations. I had to guess a lot. I have never felt like a student was cheating in my class. I teach at the northern Virginia center so am not aware of what happens on campus. I think this survey is a good first step and look forward to hearing from you.
Website / newsletter to faculty describing recent issues and how they were addressed.
Training.
My connectivity with the politics department is minimal, as my answers suggest.
Train / inform.
If you see your honor cases constantly acquitted, that is a disincentive to report cases. If the single sanction persists, that will deter convictions. So, get rid of the single sanction!
More info begets more support.
Abolish single sanction.
Education.
Faculty are put between a rock and a hard place because of single sanction. Changing this would have the biggest effect. When I report my current case (my first) I was thinking that only by using the Honor Committee could I affect change. I no longer think this. I do not know if I would report this again if faced with the same situation.
Every faculty member who initiates a case should have a faculty mentor through the process. Students simply don't have the necessary prospective on this.
Having a tiered system and more faculty buy-in.
Yes, if faculty members thought that the Honor System was fair and efficient, they would use it.
Information.
Perhaps faculty should sign a yearly promise to support the system, and it could be on the adjuncts contract that they support the Honor System.
Presentations at faculty meetings.
A written statement should be enough testimony at a trial. Vary the sanctions.
Part of the problem we have is that we're supposed to rely upon the Honor Code and be able to give unproctored exams and trust that students won't cheat on take-home assignments, but at the same time we tend to be somewhat cynical about human nature. I like to think that most of my students would be too ashamed to ever cheat on an assignment, but I know it's possible. I'd say that making the process easier for faculty when it comes to completely documentable cases (say, a paper cribbed from the internet) would encourage faculty to come forward with such cases. The peer jury is a nice idea in theory, but I have less faith in the integrity of students as a result of all the whining about the single sanction. Perhaps more clear-cut cases should be tried by a judge rather than by a jury and dealt with more quickly. If I knew for certain that a student had stolen a paper from the internet or plagiarized from a published book or article and brought a charge, I would be outraged if the student were acquitted (or somehow found guilty but not given any punishment) and I would be less likely to trust the system again if another case of cheating arose in one of my classes.
Reduce the severity of punishment
Right now it just takes a lot of time for the reporting and investigation of an offense as well as that many faculty feel it is just a bit too harsh.
More interaction.
I'm not sure people understand the necessity of support for the Honor System to work. Stressing this point may have some impact on the support of the faculty.
Require faculty to go through an orientation on the Honor System and a refresher every 3 years.
More pressure to pursue honor cases when warranted, although I don't know what options there are to apply this pressure.
I cannot imagine more support than complete engagement with the system.

Q: E4

Just regular reminders of UVa's tradition of ethical excellence.
As I am not a faculty member and don't teach at UVa this survey is difficult for me to answer.
I think the faculty supports the Honor System quite well.
Offer them / us a better understanding of the Honor System.
Begin with realistic goals. Students under pressure to excel in grades are likely to cheat. The process should be fair, simple and the punishment should fit the crime. We can't have an OJ trial for every case of speeding.
Questions / discussions about the Honor System during hiring interviews.
Increased information.
Require faculty to make clear statement in their syllabus.
Yes: bring back the non-toleration clause. This survey is starting to become too long.
I feel the support is strong, at least at the med school level.
This is a good start. Educate us. Let us know that most students want the system to work.
Increase range of sanctions
Ethics in medicine is a big issue. Increasing our knowledge of the system and the issues of ethics in medicine would likely be welcomed.
Minimize the time they must give up to report a case.
More information and flexibility with the punishment for honor violations.
If a UVa value culture is expanded then faculty should be part of its articulation and presentation.
Focus on more important issues, and don't have double standards for athletes.
More active feedback from faculty.
More student support - my understanding is very few students initiate cases, most are faculty initiated.
Good information on what it is about.
Changes above more discussion and communication
Annual report on the number of cases referred to Honor Committee, type of infractions considered and outcomes emailed to faculty to show scope of activity and effectiveness. Reports can be anonymous to preserve student privacy.
That we can ask for proof from students rather than having to play a guessing game with students.
Faculty will support the system in much greater numbers if the sanction is changed.
Have students take a more active stance in reporting cheating. It should not be up to faculty to be the enforcers. If the students themselves reported cheating, we all might take it more seriously.
Eliminate student control. Require student participation, but assign authority for the supervising it directly to faculty or administration.
Better education regarding the system is most important.
Get rid of the single sanction. Demonstrate racial equity across the board in trials and participants in the system. Allow faculty autonomy in reporting or handling infractions within the parameters set out in their own classrooms.
Stop calling my home to badger me about surveys like this one. You're not helping yourselves.
A voluntary contract to be signed by athletic staff, faculty and teaching assistants to uphold the polices of the Honor System.
Faculty should feel more involved in the process.
Perhaps an annual briefing / reminder / pep talk in a faculty meeting at the start of each year. Not long, given by some representative of the Honor Committee. Don't do e-mail. Everyone already gets too much e-mail.
Yearly updates on changes made in the system.

Q: E4

The onus is increasingly on faculty to remind students on every assignment that they are bound by the Honor Code. This is wrong. We are all bound by it. Occasional reminders are good, but not necessary.
Making the faculty more aware of it and more knowledgeable of it.
If faculty know that their decisions will be supported by the administration and not overturned.
Just give more information and make it simpler to navigate the process.
Any actions that persuade the faculty that the system really does weed out cheaters. That said, the current system is much better than some others I'm familiar with. Here at least, cheating is at a low enough level that one can operate as if the system works (so I guess it works to some extent), and that makes for a much more humane environment: a reasonable approximation to the academic village.
Make sure that all faculty is completely informed about the Honor System and what to do if a violation is suspected.
The options on the previous question are the right methods.
Educate the faculty better.
More education couldn't hurt.
Alternatives to the single sanction might help. But the cheater knows he/she will never face such a sanction, as his/her fellow students do not participate.
Change the single sanction policy.
Make the process less stressful for faculty. Many faculty members don't want to take the time to prosecute an offense and face down a student.
Attending faculty meetings. When an infraction occurs, debrief faculty as to how the process worked.
Demonstrate that the system can be effectively run by students without placing undue burden on faculty. Or provide faculty with some governance options over the system.
On-going information.
It is the simplest set of rules the university has. Yet we have allowed it to become so much litigation fodder that the faculty just are sickened by it. Get it back to being the simple rules and remove the practice of having full-time lawyers come in as defense attorneys. The honor trial should not be run like a US court. It should be student run, student prosecutors, and student defenders. Get the lawyers out of the way.
Make the system more realistic provide training and easily accessible information about the Honor System.
Abolish the single sanction policy.
Make their part easier.
None, I don't know anyone who does not support it.
A faculty member has almost no incentive to report honor offenses, since it is merely a wishing of grief and unpleasantness onto their lives for who knows how long who knows to what end. It is simply easier to pass it up. I can't see a way to fix that.
Show results - enforce the code. It is to the benefit of everyone and the student leaders should be aware of this.
Remind them of system regularly.
Sadly, no.
Educate them.
Introduce other punishment options based on the severity of the offense.
Many faculty members and TA's feel that they're really the ones who are policing cheating, in spite of all the rhetoric about a student-run Honor System. If more of this burden could be shifted to students, it would make a major difference.
I think faculty greatly supports the Honor System.
I think the faculty would support it if they saw that it was actually worth their while. If

Q: E4

students were actually punished in the manner that the system dictates they should be, the faculty would have more of a reason to believe in it. At the moment, there is no reason to believe in something that barely exists. I also think that if the faculty saw their students behaving with a more devout code of honor, they could trust that their decisions would carry that same honorable weight.
I think the Honor Committee does a good job - an email or brochure every academic year to remind faculty of they basic rules would be a good idea.
Abolish single sanction find students guilty when they are guilty.
More information.
Simpler and less time-consuming for faculty.
The Honor System represents an important element of student self-regulation and I am comfortable with students managing this effort. A related issue in self-management is course content and here I believe the university has some rethinking to do. In my own discipline of anatomy, I have seen a gradual "dumbing down" of course content and rigor; which I think represents in the long run a more serious issue for the university.
The most important way to increase faculty support is to eliminate the single sanction.
Stress to them the importance of reporting. I am aware of a few instances where cheaters have been caught, but the faculty member refuses to report it because they think they are ruining that student's life.
More information available
Awareness.
More vocal support from deans, department chairs, and the president directed toward faculty members.
Try to find more articulate faculty sponsors - those who regularly speak about it as faculty sponsors are often embarrassingly unable to communicate its rationale.
Design better survey programs that don't necessitate backward login / password procurement procedure. Do not run alienating phone and email annoyance drives to pressure people into taking surveys.
More communication with faculties.
More than one sanction would help.
Revamp the system.
Multiple sanctions. Less time commitment.
Reduce the time they have to spend on paperwork for reporting a case.
Get rid of the single sanction. Ultimately, it is we faculty who are exposed to most cases of cheating (simply by virtue of us sitting in exams, grading papers, viewing lab work) so it is we who should be initiating most of the honor cases. So, if you are getting many responses like mine, then you must take our point of view seriously if you want the Honor System to function properly. My understanding is that time and time again students vote to keep the Honor System basically unchanged despite pleas from faculty to drop the single sanction. Please take the advice from those in the front line who may want to use the Honor System but choose not to because of its colossally stupid framework.
Make more sanctions available.
Faculty are lazy. They avoid conflict. Honor System requires you to step and be a human being. But you're dealing with faculty here. Let's be realistic. Most will always prefer to go along to get along.
Just keep up an information flow and keep awareness high.
Get more faculty members educated of this system and get them involved in educating students.
Faculty do not like to be told, they like to be consulted. Consult and work with them, don't start telling them how it is, they'll resent that.
Stop the constant re-interpretations of honor. If we believe our university is better served by observing an honorable society, dismissing those who cannot the standard.



Q: E4

Give them a role in the judicial process, and more flexibility in their options and responsibilities.
Resolve the lack of commitment by students first....then address the faculty.
Increased visibility and publicity of its actions on a regular basis would help raise awareness and faculty support.
Faculty will do their part to provide students with the advantages and rewards that come with the presumption of student honor when a solid majority of students start to make the current system work again smoothly. So, it is up to the students to show the faculty that indeed the students are identifying and removing from the university community those among them that lie, cheat and steal. Honor trials and results should be divulged more openly in the UVa and Charlottesville media. If students mean business about honorable behavior, then word about this would get around. Students not favoring honorable behavior would then be less inclined to apply to UVa. Short term, as the Honor System starts working again, there would be an increase in the number of trials, but in the long term there could even be a drop in investigations and cases.
Encourage faculty to design un-cheatable exams and paper topics, that's what I do.
Make it a logical system and not one that is mired in paperwork or politics.
Enhanced training.
Talk to faculty and see what changes they would like to see.
More and quicker follow-up when a charge is investigated.
Department chairs should foster discussion at faculty meetings
By accepting a faculty position one should be obligated to abide by and support the Honor System at the university.
Better information flow.
Include faculty in the panels that are responsible for the trial decisions for alleged offenders.
The presentations at faculty meetings were excellent. I have been here for six years and this unfortunately occurred only once.
Clarity. The more, the better.
It's simple: make it believable by starting with the faculty and administrators.
Faculty wants no cheating on papers and exams. Getting input from faculty about how norms of integrity can be fostered and supported institutionally and acting on that input are the most likely way to increase faculty support for the Honor System.
Focus on the system's educational benefits, that is, on the ways that intellectual perspectives are essential for understanding concepts like honor, trust, and community. Reframe the concept of student self-governance so that it becomes clearer to faculty that there is some adult supervision of / interaction with the system. Create more opportunities for faculty members to get to know the very fine young people who run the Honor System and do so in forums smaller than big faculty meetings. Encourage faculty members who support the system to be vocal among their colleagues.
Provide faculty with educational material.
Better communication.
We probably need more situational training on how to proceed with filing an accusation.
Sorry, but no.
Even if faculty members are fully enlightened as to the intended purposes and effects of the system, it will still not be popular for the reasons stated previously, and potentially in addition to others.
We really don't have that much to do with the Honor System as clinical faculty at the medical school.
Better distribution of information.
Give faculty an actual role - maybe including serving on the Honor Committee. Reduce corruption, partly by abolishing the single sanction.

Q: E4

I've heard many stories from faculty where they feel like they were not treated fairly during the trial process. Yes, the student is innocent until proven guilty, but the faculty member would not have brought such an accusation forward if he / she didn't think it was very real. It sounded to me like faculty felt like they weren't given a fair chance to speak.
Again, I think information helps. Is there a faculty liaison?
Expose faculty to Honor System rules and regulations at meetings.
More information.
I think your mode of getting the information to us is extremely important. I tend not to always read brochures, etc., that are in my mailbox. I like the idea of having someone come to a faculty meeting to tell us about the intricacies and efficiencies of the system.
More emphasis on honor as a positive concept.
I believe it's broken beyond repair.
Professionalize and increase the number of sanctions.
No. All faculty members that I know support it, including myself. I am very thankful to the Honor System because I can trust my students, and when I see something strange in an exam, like asking your partner for a pen, I only have to say: you are under your honor and my students know what that means.