

The Honor Newsletter

April 2017 - Issue No. 13

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

I. 2017-2018 Honor Committee

The 2017-2018 Honor Committee began its term on Monday, April 3. The new Executive Committee members are:

Chair: Devin Rossin

Vice Chair for Hearings: Jeffrey Warren

Vice Chair for Investigations: Sarah Killian

Vice Chair for Education: Tamia Walker-Atwater

Vice Chair for Community Relations: Brandt Welch

You can find a [list of the entire 2017-2018 Committee](#) on the Honor website.

II. Changes to Informed Retraction

After weeks of debate and conversation surrounding a potential change to the Informed Retraction, the Honor Committee unanimously passed an amendment to its By-laws on March 26. The by-law change expands the language of a "single nexus of events," which determines whether or not multiple alleged honor offenses might be considered linked such that they could be grouped together under a single Informed Retraction.

You can [read the new By-laws](#) on the Honor website.

III. Outreach News

Review of 2016-2017 Term

We appreciate the opportunity to partner with the following organizations in our pursuit to build a stronger Community of Trust. Through co-sponsorship efforts, the Community of Trust was able to expand into categories of cultural differences, ethics, social advocacy, and advancement. These efforts have led to great discussions, deeper understanding, and necessary problem-solving for our current and future Honor System. We thank Charlottesville Leadership Workshop, Memorial for Enslaved Laborers, Minority Rights Coalition, Black Student Alliance, Latino Student Alliance, Sexual Assault Research Agency, the University Guide Service, Second Year Council, Global Development Organization, Pancakes for Parkinson's, Chinese Student Association, Animal Justice Advocates, Indian Student Association, Take Back the Night, Queer Student Alliance, Feminism is For Everyone, among others!

Honorable Mention

The Honorable Mention initiative encourages the community to recognize deeds that further foster a Community of Trust. We hope that students will begin to submit Honorable Mentions to expand the narrative of Honor's impact on the University. Students will periodically be recognized for their positive contribution to our community. Please do not limit the scope of what you believe worthy of recognition; it could range from caring for a friend in need to returning someone's lost ID. You can [nominate peers online](#).

Honor Loans

The Ivey F. Lewis Honor Loan is a short-term loan for full-time students (graduate and undergraduate) in need of emergency aid. All loans are interest-free with a maximum loan amount of \$600. Visit the Dean of Students Office in Peabody Hall or call 434-924-7133 to make an appointment.

IV. Upcoming Events

Attend an Honor Committee Meeting

The Honor Committee meets every Sunday night at 8 p.m. in Newcomb 480. Meetings are open to the public, so come and share your opinions about the Honor System!

You can find [minutes from past Committee meetings](#) on the Honor website.

V. Case Processing Updates: Case Statistics for 2016-2017 Term

Note: The numbers below only reflect cases reported to the Honor Committee between April 4, 2016, and April 2, 2017.

Reports: 49
Cases Pending: 16
Cases Dropped: 11
Left Admitting Guilt: 1
Informed Retraction: 15
Contributory Mental Disorder (CMD): 1
Not Guilty at Hearing: 3
Guilty at Hearing: 2

Conscientious Retraction (CR) and Informed Retraction (IR):

CR: The Honor System permits a student to atone for their mistakes by filing a Conscientious Retraction (CR). A valid and complete CR involves the admission of a possible Honor Offense before the student has reason to believe that such offense has come under suspicion by anyone.

IR: The Informed Retraction (IR) permits a student to atone for their mistakes after an Honor Report has been made. An IR is predicated on a student taking responsibility for the commission of an Honor Offense and making amends with all affected parties. A student must then take a two-semester leave of absence from the University.

CR: In November, a student submitted a CR for lying.

CR: In December, a student submitted a CR for lying about class attendance.

CR: In December, a student submitted a CR for lying by signing a class attendance sheet on behalf of another student.

CR: In December, a student submitted a CR for cheating on a final exam by copying off another student.

CR: In December, a student submitted a CR for cheating on a French assignment.

CR: In December, a student submitted a CR for cheating on an iClicker question.

IR: In December, a student submitted an IR for cheating on an exam by copying from another student.

IR: In December, a student submitted an IR for cheating on an exam by copying from another student.

IR: In December, a student submitted an IR for lying by falsifying a doctor's note.

IR: In December, a student submitted an IR for cheating by plagiarizing an assignment.

IR: In February, a student submitted an IR for cheating on an exam by copying from another student.

IR: In February, a student submitted an IR for cheating on an exam by using unauthorized resources.

IR: In March, a student submitted an IR for cheating on a Computer Science assignment.

VI. Honor Hearings

Four public summaries of hearings have become publishable since the previous newsletter.

Note: All public summaries are written using the pronoun "they" for purposes of confidentiality.

Hearing 1: A student from the School of Medicine was accused of lying by manipulating an academic transcript. The case was reported by an administrator. The Community argued that any reasonable student would know that manipulating a transcript is lying and that the Accused Student did so with the purpose to mislead and receive a superior letter of recommendation from a professor. The Accused Student argued that it was an honest mistake and that their purpose was not to mislead the professor. A panel of randomly-selected students found the Accused Student not guilty on the basis of Act and Knowledge.

Hearing 2: A student in the College of Arts & Sciences was accused of cheating by plagiarizing a paper. The case was reported by the professor. The Community argued that the student failed to cite information from an outside source in the paper. The Accused Student argued that ideas for the paper had been gathered from a conversation and outside source, and they did not know at the time what information needed to be cited. The Accused Student further argued that the information in the paper was not specifically copied and pasted into the paper and that the professor did not verbally address citations for the particular assignment. A panel of Honor Committee members and randomly-selected students found the Accused Student guilty.

Hearing 3: A student in the College of Arts & Sciences was accused of cheating on two assignments by using an online translator. The Community argued that the professor's analysis of the assignments relative to the student's skill level proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the student used an online translator in violation of the class Honor policy. The Accused Student argued that they used authorized tools, not an online translator, to complete both assignments, and that their previous experience in the subject explained their enhanced skill level. A panel of randomly-selected students found the Accused Student not guilty on the basis of Act and Knowledge.

Hearing 4: A student in the College of Arts & Sciences was accused of cheating on a midterm exam by copying an answer from a student sitting nearby, who had a different version of the exam. The professor teaching the course reported the case. The Community argued that the content that appeared to have been copied could not be found on the Accused Student's exam, but could be found on the exam of a student sitting nearby. Given that the student could not have generated this response from their own exam, the Accused Student must have copied it from their neighbor's test. The Accused Student argued that the number had been generated from guesswork using the numbers that were given on their version of the exam, and that they did not copy the content. A panel of randomly-selected students found the Accused Student guilty of cheating.

Want to stay connected with Honor?

Like us on [Facebook](#)

Follow us on [Twitter](#)

Visit our [website](#)

Comments, questions, concerns?

Just reply to this email!