



The Undergraduate Academic Honor Code of Emory College of Arts and Sciences, Goizueta Business School, and Oxford College

I. Preamble

The Undergraduate Academic Honor Code of Emory College of Arts and Sciences, Goizueta Business School, and Oxford College (“Honor Code”) is a commitment to our integrity and ethical principles as a community of students and scholars. The student body instituted the Honor System a century ago, and undergraduate students continue to have a fundamental role in supporting the Honor Code and addressing violations. Emory University’s mission “to create, preserve, teach, and apply knowledge in the service of humanity” only advances when the members of the community practice the highest standards of integrity and speak out when students violate the Honor Code.

The Honor Code applies to any action or inaction that fails to meet the communal expectations of academic integrity. Students should strive to excel in their academic pursuits in a just way with honesty and fairness in mind and avoid all instances of cheating, lying, plagiarizing, or engaging in other acts that violate the Honor Code. Such violations undermine both the individual pursuit of knowledge and the collective trust of the Emory community.

II. Honor Pledge

As a reminder of the commitment to academic integrity that everyone in the Emory University community has made, each student will sign the following Honor Pledge on examinations and major academic assessments, unless exempted by the faculty:

I pledge to abide by the Emory Honor Code in all academic work and avoid any action that would provide an unfair advantage.

Failure to sign the Honor Code pledge is neither an offence against the Honor Code nor a defense to an alleged Honor Code violation.

III. Jurisdiction and Honor Code Procedures

All undergraduate students enrolled in any course or program at Emory University, as well as all other individuals enrolled in undergraduate courses, are expected to abide by the Honor Code that governs their school. This Undergraduate Academic Honor Code published here will be enforced by the Honor Councils of Emory College of Arts & Sciences, Goizueta School of Business, and Oxford College for cases of academic misconduct that occur in any course within their respective schools, regardless of the degree program in which the student is enrolled. Undergraduate students in the Nell Hodgson Woodruff School of Nursing are subject to the School of Nursing’s Honor Code.

The procedures for resolving reports of Honor Code violations are described in the *Procedures of the Undergraduate Academic Honor Code* and are administered by the Honor Councils within their respective schools.

IV. Reporting Cases



Apathy or acquiescence in the presence of academic misconduct is not a neutral act. It undermines the bonds of trust and honesty among members of the Emory community, as well as between the Emory community and those who depend on our knowledge and integrity. All members of the Emory University community—students, faculty, and staff—share the responsibility and authority to challenge and report acts of apparent academic misconduct. Any member of the Emory University community who has witnessed an apparent act of academic misconduct or has information that could reasonably lead to the conclusion that such an act may have occurred or has been attempted, is responsible for promptly notifying the course instructor, a member of the Honor Council, the Honor Code administrator, or the dean.

V. Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct is a violation of the Honor Code and is generally defined as any action or inaction that is offensive to the integrity and honesty of the members of the academic community. In addition to the violations enumerated in this article, instructors at Emory University have reasonable discretion to establish specific standards and policies as related to their courses and assignments. Such additional standards and policies should be clearly articulated in the syllabus, in the assignment, or otherwise conveyed as an expectation by the instructor. It is the responsibility of each student to understand the policies established in the Honor Code, syllabi, and assignments, and act accordingly.

Academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to, the following actions:

CHEATING

- A. Seeking, using, giving, or obtaining unauthorized assistance or information in any academic assignment or examination
- B. Seeking, using, giving, or obtaining information about the content or conduct of an examination, knowing that the release of such information has not been authorized
- C. Violating the electronic device policy as described in the Honor Code
- D. Violating the testing policy as described in the Honor Code

PLAGIARIZING

- E. Plagiarizing, whether intentionally or unintentionally, in any assignment (see Appendix 1: Crediting the Work and Ideas of Others: Use of Sources and Appendix 4: On the Use of Artificial Intelligence for Assignments)
- F. Submitting duplicate material, or using the same intellectual material in part or in whole more than once without express, prior permission from every instructor for whom the original submission was, is, or would be made, at any educational institution or for any publication (electronic, academic, or otherwise)

LYING AND DISHONESTY

- G. Intentionally giving false information to professors, instructors, or university officials for the purpose of gaining academic advantage
- H. Intentionally falsifying or fabricating any information or citation in any examination, assignment, or academic exercise



- I. Falsifying, altering, or fabricating academic records, forms, or correspondence, including, but not limited to, transcripts, withdrawal forms, degree applications, or letters of recommendation, whether the documents/information are submitted within Emory University or to a third party
- J. Seeking to gain or to provide an unfair advantage during course registration

VIOLATING COMMUNITY STANDARDS

- K. Intentionally sabotaging the academic work of another student
- L. Intentionally helping or attempting to help another person to violate any provision of this Honor Code or the academic integrity policy at another educational institution
- M. Disseminating any course materials, including recordings of the class, without the permission of the instructor
- N. Committing any action or inaction which is offensive to the integrity and honesty of the members of the academic community

VIOLATING STANDARDS IN THE HONOR CODE PROCESS

- O. Intentionally giving false testimony or evidence in any Honor Council hearing or refusing to testify or give evidence when requested by the Honor Council
- P. Harassing, threatening, coercing, or bribing witnesses involved in any Honor Code case
- Q. Obstructing an Honor Code investigation
- R. Breaching any duties prescribed by this Honor Code, including breaching the confidentiality of the Honor Code process (see *Procedures of the Undergraduate Academic Honor Code*, Article IX: Confidentiality)

ELECTRONIC DEVICE POLICY

- S. The use of a cell phone, smartphone, tablet, laptop, smartwatch, headphones, or similar device for any reason during times of examination (broadly defined here as quizzes, tests, midterm and final exams, or similar assignments or evaluations) is prohibited. Instructors are entitled to make exceptions to allow the use of an electronic device for any examination. In the absence of explicit permission to use such a device, it is assumed that such devices are not permitted.

If a student is found using an electronic device during an examination, the instructor should inform the student of the issue and may ask the student to store the device until the completion of the examination. The instructor should allow the student to complete the examination before reporting the incident to the Honor Council.

TESTING POLICY

- T. Instructors are entitled to establish reasonable policies to protect the security and integrity of their examinations (broadly defined here as quizzes, tests, midterm and final exams, or similar assignments or evaluations). These policies may include, but are not limited, to: prohibitions against large bags, coats, hats, notebooks, electronic devices, or course materials; requirements to place materials unrelated to the examination outside



or at the front of the classroom; assigning seats to students; moving students during an examination; requiring a student to stop writing when time is called; and prohibiting the replication of examination materials or their removal from the testing environment. Any additional policies should be outlined in the syllabus and/or written instructions for the examination.

If a student fails to comply with the stated policies of the examination prior to its start, the instructor may withhold the examination until the student complies with the testing policies (the instructor will not be compelled to provide additional time for the completion of the examination). If a student fails to comply with or violates the stated policies of the examination after it has begun, the instructor may take reasonable steps to secure the integrity of the examination but should allow the student to complete the examination before reporting the incident to the Honor Council.

The Honor Code includes an appendix (Appendix 2: Common Forms of Misconduct) that provides information about common forms of academic misconduct. These examples are instructive and not exhaustive. The undergraduate Honor Councils will update the appendix on a regular basis. As the purpose of the appendix is to provide information and instruction about academic integrity, it may be revised without amendment.

VI. Sanctions for Academic Misconduct

When the Honor Council has determined that a violation of the Honor Code has occurred, the following is a non-exhaustive list of potential sanctions that may be imposed:

- A. An educational program
- B. A verbal warning
- C. Honor Code probation for a specified period with a reportable record. Honor Code probation will signify that the student is not in good academic standing with the University during the period of probation.
- D. Partial or no credit on the examination, evaluation, or assignment
- E. Failure of the course
- F. Any other penalty to the student's grade in the course
- G. Suspension from the undergraduate program and/or Emory University for a specified period of time
- H. Dismissal from the undergraduate program
- I. Permanent expulsion from Emory University
- J. Revocation of an Emory University degree that has been previously awarded
- K. Such combination of sanctions or a sanction different from those listed above that may be appropriate under the circumstances

VII. Rights of Students

Undergraduate students have several rights in the Honor Code process.



- A. Students are presumed not to have violated the Honor Code unless it has been determined that they are responsible in the Honor Code process.
- B. Students have a right to the appropriate level of confidentiality in the Honor Code process, though this right will not restrict communication to officials of the University where knowledge is necessary in the performance of the officials' duties, nor will it restrict disclosure required by law.
- C. Students have a right to a fair and impartial process.
- D. Students have a right to request a full hearing of the Honor Council that includes at least one student representative from their own school at Emory University.
- E. Students have a right to make an opening and closing statement and to actively participate in any Honor Council hearing, though they may not directly question witnesses.
- F. Students have a right to include an advisor in the Honor Code process so long as that advisor is not involved as a reporting party, reported student, or witness in the case. The advisor must be a current undergraduate student at Emory University; a current faculty or staff member in Emory College of Arts and Sciences, Goizueta Business School, or Oxford College; or a current staff member in Campus Life. No student, faculty, or staff member will be required to serve as a student's advisor.
- G. Students may waive any of these rights if they so choose.

VIII. Amendment of the Honor Code

The Honor Code may be amended with a vote of the students or designated student governance body and the faculty or designated faculty governance body of Emory College of Arts and Sciences, Goizueta Business School, and Oxford College. These governance bodies include the following:

- A. Emory College of Arts and Sciences: 1) the general student body and 2) the Emory College Curriculum, Assessment, and Educational Policy Committee
- B. Goizueta Business School: 1) the general student body and 2) the faculty body
- C. Oxford College: 1) the general student body and 2) the faculty body

A majority of those voting in the respective bodies of two of the three schools or programs are required to pass changes. In the event that one of the undergraduate schools or programs does not approve the changes, the dean of the school may give approval for the school to adopt the new Honor Code or discontinue the school's participation in the Honor Code and institute a different academic integrity policy.

The *Procedures of the Undergraduate Academic Honor Code* may be amended through the separate process described in Article IX of that document.

Approved by Emory College of Arts and Sciences on April 20, 2022, by Goizueta School of Business on DATE, and by Oxford College on April 22, 2022.

The Undergraduate Academic Honor Code of Emory College of Arts and Sciences, Goizueta School of Business, and Oxford College will take effect on August 24, 2022.



**Procedures of the Undergraduate Academic Honor Code of Emory College of Arts and Sciences,
Goizueta School of Business, and Oxford College**

I. The Undergraduate Academic Honor Code

All students enrolled in any course or program at Emory University are expected to abide by the Honor Code of every school in which they enroll in courses. The *Undergraduate Academic Honor Code of Emory College of Arts and Sciences, Goizueta Business School, and Oxford College* (“Honor Code”) will be enforced by the Honor Councils of Emory College of Arts & Sciences, Goizueta School of Business, and Oxford College for cases of academic misconduct that occur in any course within their respective schools, regardless of the degree program in which the student is enrolled.

The procedures for resolving reports of Honor Code violations are described in these *Procedures of the Undergraduate Academic Honor Code of Emory College of Arts and Sciences, Goizueta School of Business, and Oxford College* (“Procedures”) and are administered by the Honor Councils within their respective schools.

As detailed below, each undergraduate school or program appoints a group of students and faculty known as the Honor Council. The Honor Council administers the Honor Code according to the *Procedures of the Undergraduate Academic Honor Code of Emory College of Arts and Sciences, Goizueta School of Business, and Oxford College* and in consultation with Honor Code administrators in the schools. The Honor Council has the duty of acting as a fact-finding body for determining whether students are responsible for Honor Code violations. The Honor Council has jurisdiction over cases of academic misconduct that occur in any course within its school, regardless of the degree program in which the student is enrolled.

II. Membership in the Honor Council and Appeal Panel

A. Composition of the Honor Council and Appeal Panel

Each school or program will appoint a sufficient number of students enrolled in its own school to serve on its Honor Council and Appeal Panel. The Honor Council and Appeal Panel must include undergraduate students, but those schools with graduate programs may permit graduate students to participate on the Honor Council and Appeal Panel. The Honor Code administrator will determine the number of student members on the Honor Council and Appeal Panel, the eligibility criteria for serving, and the selection process.

The dean will appoint a sufficient number of faculty to serve as faculty members of the Honor Council and Appeal Panel. Faculty Honor Council members assist student Honor Council members in investigations and participate as voting members in hearings of the Honor Council and meetings of the Appeal Panel.



B. Selection of the Honor Council and Appeal Panel

The Honor Code administrator in each school has the authority to determine the eligibility requirements for Honor Council and Appeal Panel members, the process for selecting members, the number of members, and the duration of membership.

C. Honor Council and Appeal Panel Membership Enrollment Qualifications

Student membership on the Honor Council and Appeal Panel is ordinarily limited to students currently enrolled in the school's program, though members of the Honor Council and Appeal Panel may serve during the summer term even if they are not enrolled in summer classes. Additionally, student members on the Honor Council and Appeal Panel who graduate in the spring may continue to serve through the summer following their graduation. Student members from the Honor Council and Appeal Panel of one school may serve in the process in another undergraduate school or program on a temporary basis with the approval of the relevant deans.

D. Chair

The dean may appoint a student or a faculty member to serve as chair of the Honor Council. The chair may perform duties to assist the Honor Code administrator in the operation and organization of the Honor Council.

E. Removal of Members

The dean may temporarily or permanently remove any member of the Honor Council or Appeal Panel who:

- compromises the integrity of the Honor Code process;
- fails to meet the duties of the position;
- is unable to participate objectively and without bias; or,
- is reported for an Honor Code violation or other disciplinary infraction at the University.

If the Honor Council member wishes to contest this temporary or permanent removal, they must submit a written appeal of the decision to the Appeal Panel within seven days of receiving the dean's decision. The Appeal Panel will review the circumstances that led to the removal, and by majority vote, make a final, non-appealable decision to uphold, modify, or overturn the dean's decision.

III. Reporting Cases

A. Duty to Report

It is the responsibility of every member of the faculty, staff, and student body to cooperate in supporting the honor system and upholding the Honor Code. Any member of the Emory University community who has witnessed an apparent act of academic misconduct or has information that could reasonably lead to the conclusion that such an act may have occurred or has been attempted,



is responsible for promptly notifying the course instructor, a member of the Honor Council, the Honor Code administrator, or the dean.

A course instructor may address a student about a possible violation before making a report to the Honor Council for the purpose of clarifying a fact or detail that would remove the suspicion of misconduct. If the suspicion remains after the instructor addresses the student, then the instructor must report the incident to the Honor Council.

B. Preliminary Review of Alleged Academic Misconduct by the Dean or Their Designee

Upon preliminary review, the dean may dismiss an allegation of academic misconduct without referring it for further investigation for one of three reasons:

- The conduct does not appear to constitute academic misconduct.
- There is insufficient evidence to pursue an investigation.
- The dean deems the suspected offense trivial in nature.

If the dean determines that the allegation is not ripe for dismissal, the dean shall refer the matter to the Honor Council, as discussed below.

IV. Procedural Overview and Resolution Options

A. Overview

The Honor Council may resolve a report of a violation in one of three ways, depending on the circumstances of the case. The overview below provides students with a brief summary of the resolution options. Detailed procedures for each resolution process appear in the sections dedicated to the informal resolution meetings, the full investigation and hearing process, and administrative hearings.

1. Informal Resolution

After being notified of an alleged Honor Code violation, a reported student may choose to accept responsibility and proceed to an informal resolution meeting instead of a full investigation and hearing. The reported student will then meet with one student Honor Council member and one faculty Honor Council member or an Honor Code administrator to discuss the circumstances of the violation and its impact on the student and the community. The reporting faculty may also participate in the meeting. The informal resolution meeting serves to assist the student in reaffirming and recommitting to the values of the Honor Code and academic integrity, to learn from the incident, and to provide context to the Honor Council as it recommends sanctions to the dean and/or the reporting faculty.

2. Investigation and Full Hearing

The Honor Council uses an investigation and full hearing process to gather the facts of a case and determine whether a student is responsible for an alleged violation of the Honor Code. This process is the standard way for resolving a report of a violation, unless the student



chooses to go through informal resolution, or the case meets the special circumstances required for an administrative hearing.

An investigative team meets with the reporting faculty, any witnesses, and the reported student to gather information and evidence related to the case. At the conclusion of the investigation, the investigative team may recommend to the dean that the case be dismissed, or the investigative team may refer the case to the Honor Council for a full hearing. At a hearing, a panel of at least five members reviews evidence and hears statements from all parties, in accordance with the procedures set forth below. The panel then votes to determine whether the reported student is responsible for the violation, and if so, the panel recommends sanctions to the dean.

3. Administrative Hearing

At the discretion of the dean and upon agreement with the reported student, the facts of the case may dictate that it be handled through an administrative hearing, typically when the Honor Council is not in session or when there is unusual urgency to resolve a case. An administrative hearing combines the investigation process and hearing process into a single meeting to investigate the facts of a case and determine whether a student is responsible for an alleged violation. When a reported student agrees to use the administrative hearing option, the reporting faculty member will submit all evidence and a written statement directly to the Honor Council. The Honor Council will make the evidence and written statement available to the reported student prior to the hearing. A hearing board of three members will then convene to hear the case, determine responsibility, and, if necessary, recommend sanctions to the dean.

V. Procedures and Process - All Resolution Options

A. Notice of Charge(s)

After the Honor Council receives a report of a suspected violation, the reported student will be informed in writing of the charge, including the name of the course and the assignment, and will be referred to the *Honor Code* and *Procedures*. The Notice of Charge(s) will include information about the available resolution options.

B. Advisors to Reported Students

1. Permitted Advisors

Reported students have the right to select an advisor who meets the eligibility requirements, so long as that advisor is not involved as a reporting party, reported student, or witness in the case.

Advisors must be one of the following: a current undergraduate student at Emory University; a current faculty or staff member in Emory College of Arts and Sciences, Goizueta



Business School, or Oxford College; or a current staff member in Campus Life. No student, faculty, or staff member will be required to serve as a student's advisor.

Students may select an advisor of their own choosing, request that the Honor Council provide an advisor, or decline to have an advisor.

2. Advisor Role

The role of the advisor is to provide advice and support to the reported student throughout their case. The advisor is not a direct advocate for the reported student, and therefore, may not address the Honor Council directly on the student's behalf during meetings and hearings; nor may the advisor directly question witnesses. Students may request to speak to their advisor privately during any meeting or hearing of the Honor Council to confer about the case. Advisors who do not abide by these stipulations may be dismissed from the meeting or hearing. While the process will attempt to schedule all meetings and hearings at a time convenient for both the reported student and their advisor, meetings and hearings will not be delayed due to the unavailability of the advisor.

C. Attending Meetings of the Honor Council

Attendance at Honor Council investigation meetings, hearings, and informal resolution meetings is limited to following individuals:

- student members of the Honor Council;
- faculty members of the Honor Council;
- staff or administrators participating on informal resolution meetings or administrative hearing panels;
- the reporting party;
- the reported student and their advisor; and
- any witnesses as permitted by the Honor Council.

No other individuals are permitted to attend investigation meetings, hearings, and informal resolution meetings.

D. Evidence

Formal rules of evidence do not apply to Honor Council proceedings. The Honor Council will collect relevant evidence and present it to the reported student according to the procedures dictated by the resolution method. The Honor Council may collect evidence from the reporting party, the reported student, any witnesses, and any other individual or office that has relevant information. Reported students may also submit evidence directly to the Honor Council for consideration. Reported students will be able to review evidence prior to an informal resolution meeting, full hearing, or administrative hearing, but because of considerations around exam and assignment security, some materials may be available only for review with an Honor Council member or administrator present. Only evidence presented at the Honor Council informal



resolution meetings, full hearings, or administrative hearings will be considered in reaching a decision.

E. Witnesses

The Honor Council may call on witnesses or use witness statements for investigations, hearings, and informal resolution meetings. A witness may include any individual believed to have knowledge relevant to the reported violation, but the Honor Council will not consider character witnesses.

Witnesses will testify without oath, but with the understanding of university policies applicable to their participation. In-person witness testimony is preferred, but the Honor Council at its discretion may allow written statements to be submitted by a witness.

F. Honor Council Proceedings

Honor Council hearings and informal resolution meetings will be fair and impartial. On a case-by-case basis, the Honor Council has broad discretion to consider and weigh information it deems relevant in its proceedings, in the form of documents, witness testimony or statements, and other forms of information. Neither reported students nor their advisors may cross-examine witnesses at any stage of the process. Rather, the reported student may request that the Honor Council ask specific questions of the reporting party and any witness. The Honor Council has discretion to determine whether the question is relevant and should be asked, to reframe the question as deemed appropriate, or to decline to ask the question based on irrelevance.

The student and faculty members of the Honor Council may attend hearings and informal resolution meetings either as deliberating members or as silent observers for the purposes of training.

G. Standard of Proof, Finding of Responsibility, and Sanctions

For a finding of an Honor Code violation, the Honor Council must determine by a unanimous vote of the hearing board that there is clear and convincing evidence of a violation. "Clear and convincing" evidence means that a particular fact or set of facts is substantially more likely to be true than not to be true. If the reported student is found responsible in a hearing or accepts responsibility in an informal resolution meeting, the Honor Council will recommend any sanctions by a majority vote.

H. Summary Report, Decision, and Notification of Outcome

After any Honor Council informal resolution meeting, full hearing, or administrative hearing, the Honor Council will promptly prepare a summary of the hearing or meeting. This summary will report information that the Honor Council considered in reaching its findings and will be submitted to the dean with the accompanying recommendation and all evidence considered by the Honor Council.



The dean may impose the recommended sanction or sanctions of greater or lesser severity. Absent extenuating circumstances, the dean must notify the student in writing of the decision within ten business days.

VI. Procedures and Process – Specific to Resolution Route

A. Informal Resolution Meetings

1. Circumstances for Offering an Informal Resolution Meeting

After receiving the Notice of Charge(s), a student may choose to accept responsibility for the reported violation and request an informal resolution meeting. The student will sign an informal resolution meeting agreement, attesting that they accept responsibility for the violation, acknowledging that a full investigation and hearing of the case will not take place, and confirming that they cannot appeal the finding of responsibility but may appeal any sanctions.

At any point prior to making a final decision, the Honor Council may refer the reported student to the investigation and full hearing process if it becomes necessary to conduct an investigation or if the Honor Council finds that the student is not being fully honest and transparent in their admission of responsibility.

If a case involves multiple students, and any of the reported students do not wish to pursue an informal resolution meeting, the case will normally be referred to the investigation and full hearing process, unless the nature of the case allows the Honor Council to adjudicate each student's report separately.

2. Procedures

The informal resolution meeting will be conducted by one student Honor Council member and one faculty Honor Council member or an Honor Code administrator.

The reported student will have the opportunity to review any evidence submitted by the reporting faculty member, including any written statements collected from the reporting faculty or witnesses. The Honor Council may, but is not required to, invite the reporting faculty member to participate in the informal resolution meeting. If the reporting faculty member attends, the reported student must be given an opportunity to speak in private with the Honor Council for some portion of the meeting to address any personal or sensitive concerns if they so choose.

As the reported student has accepted responsibility for the violation, the informal resolution meeting will be an opportunity to discuss the circumstances that led to the violation and to consider its impact on the student and the academic community.



3. After the meeting with the reported student, the Honor Council will deliberate in private and recommend sanctions to the reporting faculty member and the dean. The dean may impose any sanctions apart from the penalty to the student's grade. The reporting faculty may impose any sanction related to the grade, or, defer this decision to the dean.

B. Investigation and Full Hearing Process

1. Investigation

If after the dean's preliminary review, the dean refers a report of an alleged violation to the Honor Council for an investigation, two individuals will be assigned to investigate the case. The investigative team will include at least one undergraduate student Honor Council member. The second member of the investigative team may be an undergraduate or graduate Honor Council member or a faculty Honor Council member.

The investigators will interview the reporting faculty member and the reported student(s) separately, may interview other potential witnesses, and will review any available evidence they deem relevant. The reported student may suggest the names of witnesses who can provide information or additional relevant evidence.

2. Referral

At the conclusion of the investigation, the investigators will determine whether there is a reasonable suspicion of an Honor Code violation. A reasonable suspicion is a justifiable suspicion that it is plausible that an Honor Code violation occurred based on the specific circumstances and evidence of the case. If the investigators find a reasonable suspicion, they will refer the case to a hearing and submit any relevant evidence they gathered to the Honor Council.

If the investigators find there is no reasonable suspicion of an Honor Code violation, they will recommend to the dean that the case be dismissed. The investigators will promptly submit to the dean a report about the investigation and the rationale for the dismissal. If the dean accepts the recommendation to dismiss the case, the dean will notify the student in writing of the decision normally within ten business days. If the dean does not accept the recommendation to dismiss the case, the Honor Council will schedule a hearing according to the procedures outlined below.

3. Full Hearing Notification

When a decision is made to refer a case for a full hearing, the Honor Council will work with all parties to schedule the full hearing promptly and will notify the reported student of the date and time of the hearing. The reported student must be given notice of the hearing details at least twenty-four hours in advance of the hearing. The reported student is responsible for notifying their advisor of the date and time of the hearing.



4. Full Hearing Board

Hearing boards will have five voting members. Hearing boards must include at least two undergraduate students, and at least one must come from the undergraduate school or program in which the reported violation took place. Hearing boards must also include at least one faculty member participating as a voting member.

Each school may determine whether the chair of the hearing board is a voting member or an additional non-voting member. Each school may also determine whether to include an additional non-voting member as a note-taker.

5. Procedures for Full Hearings

At a full hearing, the chair will call the hearing to order and inform the reported student of their rights. The investigator may make a brief report about the factual findings of the investigation and discuss the strength or weakness of any evidence involved. The reporting faculty member and any witnesses will separately make a statement about the alleged violation and respond to any questions from the hearing board while the reported student is present. The reported student will then make a statement and respond to any questions from the hearing board privately; the reporting faculty member, witnesses, and other reported students are not permitted to listen to this testimony. The Honor Council may recall any party for additional questions, or ask additional questions of the investigator. The reported student will then have the right to make a closing statement. At the discretion of the hearing board, any party to the case who is unable to participate in the hearing may provide a written statement that will be reviewed by the hearing board.

At the conclusion of all testimony, the hearing board will convene to deliberate privately. At any point during the deliberations, the hearing board may recall any parties or the investigator to ask additional questions before returning to their private deliberation. The Honor Council will first determine if the student is responsible for the violation before recommending any sanctions, if necessary. Only evidence presented to the hearing board will be considered in reaching a decision.

If the Honor Council reaches a unanimous decision that a student is responsible for a violation, the hearing board will receive access to the reported student's record of any prior Honor Code violations. The hearing board will consider this information as it determines the recommended sanctions.

The chair may suspend the hearing at any point to provide additional time to collect evidence, to resolve questions related to the case, to clarify answers to procedural questions, or to provide sufficient additional time for the testimony and deliberation. If the hearing is suspended, the chair will reconvene the meeting within ten business days, absent extenuating circumstances.



C. Administrative Hearing Process

1. Circumstances for Offering an Administrative Hearing

The dean has the discretion to offer any reported student an administrative hearing before a special three-person panel (“Administrative Hearing Board”) to resolve their case. Ordinarily, the administrative hearing is offered for cases when there is unusual urgency to resolve the case or when the Honor Council is not in session.

The reported student has the right to accept the administrative hearing or have their case heard according to the procedures of the investigation and full hearing process. The use of an administrative hearing does not require the student to accept responsibility for a violation, and the reported student retains the right to appeal the finding of responsibility and any sanctions. Before attending an administrative hearing, the reported student will sign the administrative hearing agreement acknowledging that an investigation and full hearing will not take place.

If the reported student accepts the opportunity for an administrative hearing, the Honor Council will then collect any evidence and a written statement from the reporting party and present these to the reported student at least twenty-four hours prior to the hearing. The reported student will appear before the Administrative Hearing Board who will consider all available evidence and make a decision about the case.

2. Administrative Hearing Board

The Administrative Hearing Board will consist of three members:

- (1) an undergraduate student Honor Council member;
- (2) a faculty Honor Council member or an Honor Code administrator;
- (3) a the third member who may be a student Honor Council member, a faculty Honor Council member, or an Honor Code administrator.

The Honor Code administrator will serve as chair of the Administrative Hearing Board for hearings that they attend, or will designate one of the Administrative Hearing Board members to serve as chair for hearings that they do not attend.

3. Procedures for Administrative Hearings

At an administrative hearing, the chair will call the hearing to order and inform the reported student of their rights. The reporting faculty member and any witnesses will separately make a statement about the alleged violation and respond to any questions from the hearing board while the reported student is present. The reported student will then make a statement and respond to any questions from the hearing board privately; the reporting faculty member, witnesses, and other reported students are not permitted to listen to this testimony. The Honor Council may recall any party for additional questions, and the



reported student will then have the right to make a closing statement. At the discretion of the Administrative Hearing Board, any party to the case who is unable to participate in the hearing may provide a written statement that will be reviewed by the Administrative Hearing Board.

At the conclusion of all testimony, the Administrative Hearing Board will convene to deliberate privately. At any point during the deliberations, the hearing board may recall any parties to ask additional questions before returning to their private deliberation. The Honor Council will first determine if the student is responsible for the violation before recommending any sanctions if necessary. Only evidence presented to the hearing board will be considered in reaching a decision.

If the Honor Council reaches a unanimous decision that a student is responsible for a violation, the hearing board will receive access to the reported student's record of any prior Honor Code violations. The hearing board will consider this information as it determines the recommended sanctions.

The chair may suspend the hearing at any point to provide additional time to collect evidence, to resolve questions related to the case, to clarify answers to procedural questions, or to provide sufficient additional time for the testimony and deliberation. If the hearing is suspended, the chair will reconvene the meeting within ten business days, absent extenuating circumstances.

VII. Appeals - Procedures and Process

A. Rights and Grounds for Appeals

Students whose cases are resolved through the full hearing or administrative hearing process may choose to appeal the finding of responsibility and/or the sanctions. Students whose cases are resolved through the informal resolution meeting may appeal the sanctions only.

Students must submit their appeal to the dean within ten business days of receiving the dean's written decision. The only grounds for submitting an appeal are as follows:

- (a) The Honor Council did not administer the procedures according to its published policies, and it is likely these errors could have substantially altered the decision of the Honor Council.
- (b) The sanctions were disproportionate to the circumstances of the violation.
- (c) There is new evidence, which could not have been reasonably discovered prior to the hearing, and it likely would have substantially altered the decision of the Honor Council.



B. Appeal Panel and Process

Upon receipt of an appeal, the dean, or their designee, will convene an appeal panel of two undergraduate students and two faculty members, who have had no prior involvement in the case or the underlying facts.

The Appeal Panel will review the reported student's appeal letter, the evidence, any reports from the investigation, hearing, or informal resolution meeting, and any other materials presented in the case. The Appeal Panel may seek clarification of points raised in the hearing or the appeal by conferring with members of the Honor Council or by collecting additional evidence if needed. After reviewing the appeal, the members of the Appeal Panel will make a recommendation to the dean to:

- (a) deny the appeal and affirm the finding of responsibility and sanctions;
- (b) affirm the finding of responsibility but modify the sanctions in any way the panel deems fit; or,
- (c) remand the case to the Honor Council for a new hearing according to the procedures for a rehearing.

After conferring with the Appeal Panel, the dean will make a final decision and promptly notify the reported student of the decision in writing normally within ten business days.

C. Procedures for a Rehearing

If the dean determines that the case should be remanded to the Honor Council, a rehearing will be scheduled. The rehearing will only include members of the Honor Council who have had no prior involvement in the case. The rehearing will follow all the procedures of a full hearing with one exception: The dean will ask one member of the Appeal Panel to attend the hearing as a non-voting member. The Appeal Panel member will ensure that the concerns of the Appeal Panel are addressed at the rehearing; they may participate in the deliberation but may not vote on the question of whether the Honor Code was violated. All evidence available at the original hearing will be available at the rehearing, including reporting parties and witnesses, unless the basis for the rehearing calls for the exclusion of any evidence. If any of the reporting parties or witnesses are unavailable, the Honor Council may accept written statements in their absence.

VIII. Special Provisions

A. Reported Student Participation in the Process

It is expected that students reported for a possible Honor Code violation will participate fully in the process. If a reported student fails to respond to messages of the Honor Council in a timely manner or is absent from any investigative meetings or hearings without good cause, the Honor Council may investigate and/or hear the case in the student's absence.



B. Cases Involving Multiple Students

For cases in which multiple students are suspected of the same violation or a related violation, the dean will decide whether a single collective hearing for all reported students or an individual hearing for each reported student is appropriate.

If the Honor Council holds a single hearing for all students involved, each student will have the right to hear the testimony of any witnesses other than those students reported as part of the same case. If the Honor Council holds individual hearings for each student involved, the Honor Council may require the reported students to appear as witnesses at the individual hearings.

C. Cases Involving Multiple Charges Against the Same Student

For cases in which one student is charged with multiple violations of the Honor Code in a single course, the Honor Council may hold a single hearing to consider all charges. For cases in which one student is suspected of violations in multiple courses, the Honor Council will normally hold separate hearings to consider charges in each course. However, the reported student may request that all charges be resolved at a single hearing. The dean has the discretion to grant or deny the request.

D. Introducing Additional Charges during Honor Code Investigations and Hearings

The Honor Council may add, remove, or modify charges against a reported student at any point in the process, provided that the student is notified of the changes and has an opportunity to respond to the new charges. This provision includes the addition of charges during an Honor Council hearing when the Honor Council suspects that a reported student has deliberately misrepresented information while testifying, has provided false evidence, or has withheld evidence.

In addition, if the Honor Council discovers information that may violate other Emory policies, the Honor Council may refer those matters to the student conduct or disciplinary offices that have jurisdiction over such conduct.

E. Course Enrollment and Grading Basis

A student may not change the grading basis for a course (i.e. switch between a letter grade and satisfactory/unsatisfactory) or withdraw from a course in which an Honor Council investigation is pending. If a student makes such a change to their enrollment, and it is later determined that the student's work was in violation of the Honor Code, the dean may restore the student's original grading basis, reinstate the student in the course, or impose a grade of F, WF, U, or WU upon the recommendation of the Honor Council or Appeal Panel.

F. Sanctions Involving Students Who Have Cross-Registered

If a student is found responsible for an Honor Code violation in a course where they have cross-registered in a different school, the Honor Council may recommend appropriate sanctions. If the sanction involves suspension, dismissal from the program, permanent expulsion from Emory



University, or revocation of an Emory University degree that has been previously awarded, the recommendation will be forwarded to the dean of the school in which the student is primarily enrolled. The dean of the school in which the student is primarily enrolled will make a decision about the sanction of the case. This provision applies to decisions of the Honor Council and of the Appeal Board.

G. Modifications to Procedures

The procedures set forth in the *Procedures of the Undergraduate Academic Honor Code* may be modified at the discretion of the dean in response to any exigencies. These changes normally include modifications to the size or composition of investigation teams and hearing panels, but may include modifications to any of the processes set forth above. The reported student will be given notice of any such modification and has the right to accept any modifications or to reject the modifications and resolve the case according to the procedures outlined above.

H. Faculty Compliance

Faculty members may not impose penalties or sanctions that are contrary to the final decision of the Honor Council or Appeal Panel.

IX. Miscellaneous

A. Confidentiality

All proceedings under the Honor Code are confidential to the extent practicable, and those participating in the proceedings have a duty to keep information related to it confidential. Breaches of confidentiality are addressed through the Honor Code, any applicable conduct codes, or disciplinary action taken against employees for breaches of university policy. Nothing in this paragraph will restrict communication to officials of the university where knowledge is necessary in the performance of the officials' duties, nor will it restrict disclosure required by law.

B. Dean and Designees

Wherever "dean" appears in the *Honor Code* or *Procedures*, it refers to the dean of the school that has responsibility for adjudicating the case, and will include any person designated by the dean of the individual school to act in their place. This may be an administrator, faculty member, or staff member.

C. Chair and Designees

Wherever "chair" appears in the *Honor Code* or *Procedures*, it will include any member of the Honor Council designated by the dean or the chair to act in the chair's place.



D. Honor Code Administrator

Wherever “Honor Code administrator” appears in the Honor Code or *Procedures*, it refers to any staff, faculty member, or administrator member designated to assist the Honor Council in the administration of the Honor Code.

E. Amendments to the Procedures

The *Procedures of the Undergraduate Academic Honor Code of Emory College of Arts and Sciences, Goizueta School of Business, and Oxford College* may be changed by the agreement of the deans of Emory College of Arts and Sciences, Goizueta Business School, and Oxford College, or their designees, after conferring with their respective Honor Councils and the Office of General Counsel.

Approved by Emory College of Arts and Sciences on April 20, 2022, by Goizueta School of Business on June 15, 2022, and by Oxford College on April 22, 2022.

The *Procedures of the Undergraduate Academic Honor Code of Emory College of Arts and Sciences, Goizueta School of Business, and Oxford College* takes effect on August 24, 2022.



EMORY UNIVERSITY

Appendices to the Undergraduate Academic Honor Code of Emory College of Arts and Sciences, Goizueta School of Business, and Oxford College

APPENDIX I: CREDITING THE WORK AND IDEAS OF OTHERS: USE OF SOURCES

An author's facts, ideas, phraseology, and other work, such as tables and graphs, should be regarded as their property. Any person who uses an author's facts, ideas, phraseology, or other work without giving due credit is responsible for plagiarism.

Information may be put into a paper, report, or other assignment without a citation only if it meets all of the following conditions:

- It may be found in several sources on the subject.
- It is written entirely in the words of the student.
- It is not paraphrased from any particular source.
- It therefore belongs to common knowledge.

Generally, if a student writes while looking at a source or while looking at notes taken from a source, a citation should be given.

Content generated by artificial intelligence programs must be cited and properly acknowledged, and students should only use this content in instances when the professor of the course has authorized it. Editing content generated through artificial intelligence programs is not considered to be work "written entirely in the words of the student" and must, therefore, be cited.

Whenever any idea is taken from a specific work, even when the student writes the idea entirely in their own words, there must be a citation giving credit to the author responsible for the idea. The methods of citation vary and may include:

- Footnotes
- Endnotes
- Parenthetical citations
- Numerical citations

The point is that the student should give credit where credit is due. The student should follow the guidelines for citation in the manner specified by the instructor of the course or the department. In the absence of any specific guidelines, students should follow a standard citation style (e.g. APA, MLA, Chicago notes).

The student is entirely responsible for knowing and following the principles of proper paraphrasing: "In paraphrasing you are expressing the ideas of another writer in your own words. A good paraphrase preserves the sense of the original, but not the form. It does not retain the sentence patterns and merely substitute synonyms for the original words, nor does it retain the original words and merely alter the sentence patterns. It is a genuine restatement. Invariably it should be briefer than the source."*



EMORY UNIVERSITY

* Floyd C. Watkins, William B. Dillingham, and Edwin T. Martin, *Practical English Handbook*, 3rd ed. (Boston, 1970), p. 245.

Direct quotations (copying a passage word for word) require the following:

- The quotation should be placed in quotation marks or indented for block quotations.
- A citation must be given.
- The quotation should not be altered in a way that would change the meaning of the text. Ellipses may be used to indicate omitted words and square brackets may be included to clarify meaning or make small changes to integrate the quotation into the passage.

Even when a student uses only one unusual or key word from a passage, that word should be quoted. If a brief phrase that is common is used as it occurs in a source, the words should be in quotation marks with a citation.

It is the prerogative of the instructor to prescribe that no secondary sources may be used for particular assignments.

A student who uses a secondary source must remember that the very act of looking up a book, article, or other source should be considered as a pledge that the student will use the material according to the principles stated above.

Emory has various resources to assist students with using and citing sources, including:

- BBA Writing Center
- Emory Libraries, Research Help, [Citing and Using Sources](#)
- Emory Writing Center, [Appointments](#)
- [Online Resources for Writers](#)



EMORY UNIVERSITY

APPENDIX II: COMMON FORMS OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Article 5 of the Honor Code list general categories of violations. This appendix clarifies the Honor Code by providing typical examples of academic dishonesty. This list is not intended to be exhaustive. If you are in doubt about any action, contact your professor for clarification.

Exams

Any attempt to gain or give an unfair advantage during an exam is considered a violation of the Honor Code. Such violations include:

- Attempting to look at or copy from another student's exam
- Attempting to provide answers to another student
- Programming a calculator with answers or other information
- Accessing information on a smart device
- Using notes or other unauthorized information during an exam
- Looking at an older version of the exam without the professor's permission
- Using a test bank or tub file without the professor's permission
- Taking an exam for someone else or having someone take an exam for you
- Submitting someone else's name on an exam

Because study partners often have similar answers on an exam, the Honor Council recommends that students not sit near their study partners during a quiz or test.

The use of an electronic device for any reason during an exam or testing situation without permission is strictly prohibited and violates the Honor Code.

Written Assignments

Plagiarism is the use of someone else's words, ideas, or work without providing proper credit. Whether the act is intentional or not, the Honor Council considers any form of plagiarism to be a violation of the Honor Code. Some examples of plagiarism and other academic misconduct in written work include:

- Submitting the same or similar work for more than one class without the approval of both professors (double submission or self-plagiarism)
- Using someone else's words without quotation marks and proper attribution
- Using information or ideas without acknowledging the source



EMORY UNIVERSITY

- Paraphrasing a text without acknowledging the source
- Improperly paraphrasing a passage by using language or structure that is too similar to the original source
- Purchasing a paper or using an online paper assistance website
- Having any one than yourself write any part of your paper or assignment (including using artificial intelligence programs for any part of an assignment without authorization and acknowledgment)
- Using false page numbers or creating false citations

Group Work and Collaboration

Collaboration on a paper, test, lab, homework, or any other assignment is only allowed with the express permission of the professor. Do not assume that because you are allowed to collaborate on one type of assignment or in one class that you are allowed to do the same with other assignments or other classes. When in doubt, always ask your professor. Violations involving multiple students and group work include:

- Copying any part of an assignment, including answers, graphs, figures, and data
- Sharing your paper or assignment with another student without the professor's permission
- Including someone's name on a project for credit when they didn't contribute to the work

The Honor Council advises students to refrain from sending or providing copies of their work to other students to prevent this work from being stolen or copied.

Dissemination of Content Related to the Course

Lectures, classroom presentations, and course materials presented or distributed in person or online are for the sole purpose of educating students enrolled in the course. The release of such information (including but not limited to directly sharing, screen capturing, or recording content) is strictly prohibited unless the instructor clearly states otherwise. Doing so without the permission of the instructor will be considered an Honor Code violation, and may also be a violation of state or federal law, such as the Copyright Act.



EMORY
UNIVERSITY

Other Issues

There are a number of others actions that constitute academic misconduct. These include, but are not limited to:

- Providing false information to a professor (e.g. falsely claiming sickness or a family death to get an extension)
- Creating false data for an assignment
- Signing someone else into class
- Forging a signature on an academic document
- Falsifying a transcript or other university document
- Seeking to gain or provide an unfair advantage during registration
- Resubmitting altered work for a higher grade
- Intentionally sabotaging the academic work of another student
- Intentionally disrupting the conduct of an exam to gain or provide an academic advantage
- Intentionally preventing other students from accessing resources for an assignment
- Offering a professor a bribe for a higher grade
- Using artificial intelligence programs for any part of an assignment without acknowledgment in the assignment. Note that faculty may also prohibit the use of outside resources, including AI programs, entirely.



EMORY
UNIVERSITY

APPENDIX III: ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT IN THE ONLINE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

As members of Emory University's academic community, you are expected to adhere to the standards set forth in the Honor Code regardless of whether you are completing course work in person or online. Accordingly, be aware that the Honor Code can be implicated in certain instances when you interact and collaborate with others, or when you consult, discuss, use, or share your own work or the work of others, especially in the online learning environment. In addition, there are other forms of misconduct that may be specific to online formats. The list below is not intended to be exhaustive. **If you are in doubt about whether actions you are contemplating are problematic, you should contact your professor directly for clarification.**

Exams Administered in Synchronous & Asynchronous Formats

Any attempt to provide or gain an unfair advantage may be considered a violation of the Honor Code. Such violations include:

- Asking another individual to complete an exam on your behalf
- Attempting to access another student's exam
- Attempting to provide answers to another student through any form of communication. This may include: email, text message, phone call, instant messaging applications or programs, file sharing, screen sharing, or screen mirroring of any kind
- Disseminating information about the contents of an exam to one or more students
- Attempting to screen capture, copy, or retain exam questions for yourself or others without the permission of the instructor
- Sharing your login credentials with others for the purpose of providing or seeking unauthorized assistance
- Accessing course content or materials related to the course during an exam (except when permission has been given for an open-book or open-resource exam)
- Plagiarizing content in an open-book or open-resource exam
- Accessing the internet beyond the exam administration platform (e.g. Canvas, Examity)
- Failing to share your screen with the instructor when requested
- Failing to cooperate with the exam proctor. This may include: failing to keep your webcam on as instructed, leaving the view of your webcam, or failing to use the webcam to demonstrate that your exam space is clear
- Failing to follow any instructions related to the Honor Code or academic integrity



EMORY
UNIVERSITY

Electronic Device Policy: The online teaching environment requires the use of a computer to complete your work. Be advised that the use of other electronic devices for any reason during an exam or testing situation without explicit permission from your professor is strictly prohibited and violates the Honor Code. This includes but is not limited to calculators, mobile phones, tablets, smartwatches, or any other device.

Written Assignments Submitted in the Online Teaching Environment

Plagiarism is the use of someone else's words, ideas, or work without providing proper credit. Whether the act is intentional or not, the Honor Council considers any form of plagiarism to be a violation of the Honor Code. Some examples of plagiarism and other academic misconduct in written work submitted to courses through remote instruction include:

- Collaborating with others when the work is expected to be individual (this could be as broad as sharing ideas)
- Seeking editing assistance from unauthorized individuals such as paid tutors or editors
- Seeking assistance of any kind from a native speaker in language courses
- Soliciting others to complete your academic work (whether for pay or not)
- Completing academic work for other students (whether for pay or not)

Dissemination of Content Related to the Course

Lectures, classroom presentations, and course materials presented or distributed in person or online are for the sole purpose of educating students enrolled in the course. The release of such information (including but not limited to directly sharing, screen capturing, or recording content) is strictly prohibited unless the instructor clearly states otherwise. Doing so without the permission of the instructor will be considered an Honor Code violation, and may also be a violation of state or federal law, such as the Copyright Act. All other University policies remain in effect for students participating in online education.



EMORY
UNIVERSITY

Appendix IV: ON THE USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE FOR ASSIGNMENTS

Using an artificial intelligence program to generate any content for any assignment (including, but not limited to examinations, papers, homework, and creative work) constitutes plagiarism and is a violation of the Honor Code unless students acknowledge in the assignment the extent to which an artificial intelligence program contributed to their work and outside resources are permitted for the assignment. The use of an artificial intelligence program for an academic assignment when outside resources are not permitted or when the use of artificial intelligence programs is prohibited may also constitute seeking unauthorized assistance or violate other provisions of the Honor Code. Students should reach out to their professors to inquire about the appropriate use of artificial intelligence programs if students are unclear about the expectations.

Updated Spring 2023