



University of Tennessee, Knoxville
**TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative
Exchange**

Senior Thesis Projects, 1993-2002

College Scholars

2000

A University Honor Code

Joseph Caldwell

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_interstp2

Recommended Citation

Caldwell, Joseph, "A University Honor Code" (2000). *Senior Thesis Projects, 1993-2002*.
https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_interstp2/39

This Project is brought to you for free and open access by the College Scholars at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Senior Thesis Projects, 1993-2002 by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

A University Honor Code:

A study of academic integrity, honor codes, their effects on college campuses, and possible implementation at the University of Tennessee

Joseph M. Caldwell
College Scholars

Project Advisor
Dr. Faye Julian

Committee Members
Dr. Thomas Broadhead
Mr. Bryan Coker
Dr. David Tandy

Defense
Monday August 7, 2000

Table Of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>page number</u>
Introduction.....	1
Academic Integrity on College Campuses.....	2
Definition of Honor Codes.....	7
Case Studies of Traditional Honor Codes.....	12
A. The University of Virginia.....	13
B. The University of North Carolina.....	17
C. Duke University.....	20
Case Studies of Modified Honor Codes.....	23
A. The University of Maryland.....	24
B. Kansas State University.....	30
C. The University of South Carolina.....	33
The University of Tennessee Honor Code.....	36
Need at the University of Tennessee.....	45
Conclusion.....	47
Appendices.....	50
Works Cited.....	57

The University of Tennessee was established in 1794 to educate the students of this state. For over two hundred years the University of Tennessee has been a source of pride to its many graduates and has maintained a reputation as one of the country's top universities. The University of Tennessee is a dynamic institution that now finds itself at another crossroads in its endeavor to develop individuals through knowledge and personal growth. At no point in history is knowledge more important than in the current "information age." Along with knowledge comes the responsibility of educating future generations on ethics and values. Academic honesty has become a topic of current research and debate in institutions of higher education.

This thesis will examine academic integrity in higher education and the many issues surrounding academic dishonesty on college campuses. Through research, interviews, and personal experiences, this study will articulate honor codes and policies, demonstrate the need for academic integrity on college campuses, examine case studies of different honor systems from institutions across the nation, discuss past attempts of honor code implementation and dialogue at the University of Tennessee, and evaluate the necessity and feasibility of an honor system at our University.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

Academic integrity on college campuses has been the focus of much debate and even more research in recent years. Educators are concerned with what they see as a breakdown in traditional societal norms. According to the Center for Academic Integrity (CAI 1), “While integrity and personal pride are thought to have been key attributes of people’s lives during the birth of our nation, many feel that today’s world is characterized by cheating at all levels, of all sorts, all around.” Many students are cheating, not because they are struggling in their academic endeavors, but because they fear failure. Most Americans perceive below average students as the only ones cheating; yet today, they are joined by above-average college-bound students. “Students feel justified in what they are doing. They are cheating because they see others cheating, and they think they are being unfairly disadvantaged. The only way many of them feel they can stay in the game, to get into the right school, is to cheat as well,” claims Donald McCabe, founding president of The Center for Academic Integrity (CAI 2-3).

According to a 1988 study commissioned by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) (“Academic Cheating Background”

<http://www.nocheating.org/adccouncil/research/cheatingbackgrounder>), teens were less likely than their parents to disagree with the following statements:

- Cheating is OK because no one really gets hurt.
- Getting into college is so important that doing whatever it takes is OK.
- Today’s schools are so competitive that sometimes it’s OK to bend the rules a little and cheat to get ahead.

With the pressures of obeying parents, earning money, and preparing for the future, it is not surprising that sixty-five percent of high school students say they would cheat on an important exam (CAI <http://www.academicintegrity.org>).

Influenced by parents, peers and media, many young adults have already developed a portion of their value system by the time they have reached college. Many middle-schoolers believe that grades are more important than education. According to a recent survey noted in the ETS/AD (“Academic Cheating Background” ETS) council campaign, two-thirds of middle school respondents reported cheating on exams, while nine-tenth of the respondents reported copying another’s homework. The ETS

also reports that a poll of “Who’s Who Among American High School Students (“Academic Cheating Background” ETS) shows eighty percent of the country’s best students cheated and most were not caught . Almost half of those surveyed did not see anything wrong with cheating and viewed it as “no big deal” (“Academic Cheating Background” ETS).

The Josephson Institute of Ethics also conducted a survey among 20,000 middle and high school students ("The Josephson Institute" <http://www.josephsoninstitute.org>). Among the findings, sixty-four percent of high school students admitted to cheating in 1996 and seventy percent in 1998. In the 1940’s, twenty percent of college students admitted to some form of cheating in high school, while today between seventy-five and ninety-eight percent of college students each year report to have cheated in high school (“The Josephson Institute”).

Academic dishonesty not only comes from middle and high schools, but also from colleges and universities across this nation. Studies have been completed for nearly forty years, and each proceeding survey has shown an increase in academic dishonesty. In 1941, Drake reported a cheating rate of twenty-three percent. In 1960, Golden, Rosenberg, William, and Suchman published cheating rates as high as thirty-eight percent in 1952, and forty-

nine percent in 1960. Unfortunately, by 1989, Jendrek found the rate to be between forty and sixty percent and as high as eighty-two percent in 1986 (qtd. in Smith 1997, 1).

Bill Bowers (1964) conducted a study in 1963 including 5,000 students on 99 campuses of all sizes and geographic regions. This was the first survey of its kind and today still holds a strong grip on cited research concerning the area of academic integrity. In its conclusions, this study illustrated the importance of promoting academic integrity into a college campus through the use of formal honor codes. Bowers came to the conclusion that an honor code was the means by which to yield academic dishonesty (Bowers 1964).

A supplemental study took place in 2000 in which Donald McCabe explored twenty-one college campuses across the country including 2,100 students, 1,000 faculty and 200 administrators. This study asked students about academic dishonesty and the culture of the campus. McCabe, because of his extensive research on this topic, has become the national expert and spokesperson for academic integrity. His study has become the benchmark survey on the topic of cheating in higher education. Twelve of the twenty-one campuses surveyed had honor codes. On the nine campuses which did

not employ an honor code strategy, sixty-eight percent admitted to one or more instances of serious cheating. This type of cheating would include: copying from another student on a test or exam, submitting work that had been completed by another student, and plagiarizing. An additional fifteen percent of the respondents reported less serious forms of cheating including collaborating with other students to complete an individual assignment. Forty-five percent of students on campuses without an honor code reported cheating on a test. The problem comes with the frequency of cheating by individuals on these campuses without an honor system. One in six students reported cheating more than three times according to McCabe's definition of cheating ("New Research on Academic Integrity" <http://www.collegepubs.com/ref/SFX000515>).

Faculty were also surveyed; ninety percent of respondents were aware of an incident of cheating in their classroom in the last two years, and thirty-two percent did not report the incident. Many faculty members are concerned with legal issues and usually decide to give the cheating student a lighter penalty or even "look the other way." According to the study, eleven percent of the faculty who had witnessed cheating have never done more than reprimand the student. This study is the focus of most arguments that

cheating has become a major issue facing our educational system at the college level. Luckily, this study also presents a tool to secure a campus that evokes academic integrity (Weiss 2000). The McCabe study on academic integrity as well as the Bowers study both suggest that an honor code is a successful combatant to academic dishonesty. These codes require students to pledge to not cheat, have a role in the judicial process, and often allow the students to take unproctored exams. Honor code campuses boasted much lower rates of cheating than those that did not have honor systems. Compared to the forty-five percent on non-code campuses, less than one quarter self-reported an instance of serious cheating on an exam. Fifty-three percent of the students on honor code campuses reported one or more instances of serious cheating on an exam or written work, compared to the sixty-eight percent on non-code campuses. The level of students who cheated frequently dropped from seventeen percent on non-code schools to six percent on code campuses (McCabe 1993).

DEFINITION OF HONOR CODES

Exploring large state institutions further qualifies these findings to relate to the University of Tennessee. McCabe has continued his work concerning

academic integrity in which he studied three state schools who had adopted a modified honor code approach. It is important to understand the difference between a traditional honor code and a modified honor code. Traditional academic honor codes include such aspects as unproctored exams, the use of a formal pledge by the students, and a strong student role in the judicial process. Many institutions with traditional honor codes require students to report any cheating they may witness among other students (qtd. in Smith 1997, 12-13). Modified honor code approaches include judicial systems maintained by students, constant dialogue concerning the importance of the honor code, and communication of the policies. “What modified honor code approaches do, is place a strong campus focus on the issue of academic integrity (“New Research on Academic Integrity” 2000).”

Cheating has been found to be more wide-spread at large state schools, but only one third of the students on these campuses self-reported serious cheating on exams and fifty-eight percent reported serious cheating on exams and written work combined. Until recently, the effects of a modified honor code on a large college campus has only had "anecdotal" evidence. McCabe’s research (2000) shows empirical data which demonstrated the success of an honor system at a large public university.

The three public schools that were chosen in this survey were the University of California at Davis, Kansas State University, and the University of Maryland at College Park (the last two will be discussed in detail). The large public university with a modified honor code did not have as low of an instance of cheating on exams (33%) as did private universities with honor codes (23%), but did have a lower rate than those campuses without a code (45%). As mentioned before, seventeen percent of respondents on campuses without honor codes self reported at least three incidents of serious cheating, while large public institutions with modified honor systems reported a ten percent level of serious cheating. These are very favorable findings as we begin to compare and analyze honor systems that may be effective at the University of Tennessee campus (“New Research on Academic Integrity” 2000).

Although academic integrity has just recently been a topic of conversation in the realm of higher education, honor codes have dominated many institutions throughout history. The Christian Science Monitor in 1987 reported that in the 1950’s honor codes played an important part in the operations of colleges and universities (qtd. in Smith 1997, 11). However, with the changes of attitudes toward authority in the proceeding decades,

the value system in this country seemed to diminish from those traditions. Yet, according to McCabe and Trevino (1993), “honor codes look like they are in a state of revival on America’s college campuses.”

Most honor codes have been in place for decades at small institutions and military schools (Smith 1997). To be able to understand the potential affects an honor code may have on these institutions, it is important to understand how they work. An honor code is a way for the institution to define wrong-doing and communicate expectations regarding inappropriate behavior. The honor code is a way in which the institution is able to place the responsibility upon the student. If the student were to cheat, plagiarize, or perform other acts of dishonesty, then not reporting the act directly affects the student’s “character and honor” (Smith 1997). Also under the honor code, students are required to identify any and all incidents that “break” the honor code made by fellow students or themselves. Students are expected to “uphold moral academic standards for themselves and for the community” (Smith 1997). In addition to maintaining “honor” and upholding moral standards, the honor system relies upon the students to run the system.

At many institutions, a council made up entirely of students is in charge of hearing all cases concerning acts of academic dishonesty. Honor councils and committees are usually elected representatives from the student body and are given the right to determine guilt and assign punishments. At institutions such as the University of Virginia, when the student is found guilty of an honor code violation, the student is dismissed from the university. At most universities, the honor code is written in catalogs or handbooks but is never known by much of the faculty and student body. A successful honor system is one that “clearly explicates the idea of an honor code, as well as the specific requirements and expectations, in the published literature of the university, and perhaps more importantly, communication of the meaning of the honor system to the faculty and staff who then consistently relay its importance to the students is imperative to assist in the establishment of an integral moral environment (Smith 1997, 14).”

By signing or speaking an honor code, the student is pledging to maintain academic integrity. This pledging is an important part of the success of an honor code, because it forces the student to actively agree to the academic integrity and moral code that is set forth by the university.

Some institutions have the honor code on every examination while others have an actual honor ceremony in which all students and faculty recite the code.

When a breach of the honor code takes place, it is the responsibility of the institution to make the student understand what ethical code has been broken and the actions that will be taken. This establishes an environment that promotes academic integrity and can form a strong set of values for the university community. An honor code also instructs the students on such ideas as honesty, respect, truth, and tolerance. Another positive aspect for students at honor code institutions is the fact that many offer unproctored examinations and take home tests as a privilege for maintaining academic integrity within the honor system. The College of William and Mary, Rice University, and the University of Virginia, for example, offer these privileges and promote students' confidence in their own maturity.

CASE STUDIES OF TRADITIONAL HONOR CODES

Researching institutions that have honor codes in place compounds the defense of this thesis concerning academic integrity. Many differences and similarities characterize institutions that cultivate academic integrity.

The University of Virginia, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and Duke University are excellent examples of schools with honor codes.

These universities were examined because of their long history of a successful honor code and the fact that these are all larger institutions.

Although one is private, the other two are public state schools and have many of the same attributes as the University of Tennessee.

A. University of Virginia Honor Code

The University of Virginia has one of the longest standing honor systems in the country. The Virginia Honor code has survived for over 150 years as an entirely student-run system. The honor code was founded in 1842 at Virginia and has changed little over time. The code reads:

Each student is charged with the responsibility to refrain from dishonorable conduct. Accompanying this individual commitment to abide by the Honor System is an even more demanding commitment, a responsibility to ask those who violate our standard of honor to leave the University. Accepting these responsibilities is vital to the successful maintenance of our student-run Honor System (“Honor Committee Constitution-UVA”

<http://scs.student.Virginia.EDU/~honor>) (See Appendix A).

The honor code goes further to identify areas of academic fraud. Today, the code defines plagiarism, multiple submission, false citation, false data, and

misuse of internet resources as forms of cheating. The code expects all members of the University community to know what is considered to be “Academic Fraud.” To further promote these areas of academic honesty, the student may consult “The Academic Fraud and the Honor System Pamphlet” that is available in the Honor offices. Communication through literature is an important aspect of publicizing academic integrity within the student body (“Honor Committee Constitution-UVA”).

The Honor code at the University of Virginia is protected and guided by an elected group of students who form the Honor Committee. The powers of the Honor Committee were documented by a constitution in 1977. This prestigious committee has been a long-standing tradition of the Honor Code. The committee consists of two elected representatives from each school and a third representative from the largest college (Arts & Sciences). The committee is run by a committee chair, and four vice-chairpersons. The twenty-one members are ultimately responsible for the maintenance and administration of the Honor Code. With one hundred support officers, the Honor Committee conducts honor investigations and trials, promotes information about the honor code and establishes programs

and policies for the maintenance of the System from year to year. The Honor Committee was charged with the following responsibilities:

Determine and publicize what constitutes, in the view of the current student generation of the University, an honor violation;

Hear through honor panels appeals from accusations of honor violations;

Exclude permanently from student status University students found to have committed honor violations;

Record honor violations and announce the disposition of honor accusations;

Establish programs, policies, and guidelines for the operation and maintenance of the Honor System;

Establish rules for appeals from honor accusations and from the findings of honor panels; and

Inform present and prospective students and faculty of the philosophy and operation of the Honor System (“Honor Committee Constitution-UVA”: Article II.).

If for some reason a person witnesses an honor offense, the student is to contact an “Honor Advisor.” The Honor Advisor is a member of the Honor Committee that can explain to the student the three criteria whereby which an offense has taken place. The three criteria:

- **Act: Was the act of lying, cheating or stealing committed?**
- **Intent: Was the act committed willfully or intentionally?**
- **Seriousness: Would open toleration of such an act impair the community of trust sufficiently enough to warrant permanent dismissal from the University**

The Honor Advisor in no way tells the student whether the case should be initiated but allows the witness to come to this conclusion. The Honor Advisor is a resource. If a student decides to initiate a case, the breach in the honor code is then sent to the Vice Chair for Investigations and cannot be rescinded. The system also offers a “Conscientious Retraction” that affords to every student who has committed a dishonest act to admit to his/her actions and accept the consequences without actually leaving the university community. This must be done before a student has any knowledge of a case being initiated against them. For a student that is found guilty through the randomly selected student jury, they are to leave the University of Virginia. Virginia has also been known to take back diplomas of individuals found guilty of a violation after they had graduated from the University (“Honor Committee Constitution-UVA”: Conscientious Retractions).

The code has maintained positive feedback throughout its years as well. According to a survey initiated by the Honor Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC), with a thirty-six percent response rate from University of Virginia faculty, sixty percent of the respondents had a “somewhat/very” positive opinion of the Honor System. About sixty-five percent of the

faculty are in favor of a student run system. The only slight variation in views came at the immediate dismissal from the institution policy. Instead of the current single sanction system, sixty-three percent of the faculty favored a multiple sanction. The multiple sanction system would allow for punishments to range from probation to dismissal. The University of Virginia is the “benchmark” of academic honor codes because of its long standing idealism and tradition. This system proves that an honor system can be effective and at the forefront of dialogue at a state institution (“Honor Committee Constitution-UVA”: UVA Honor System’s Survey 1999).

B. University of North Carolina Honor Code

The University of North Carolina is another large state institution that has maintained a standing academic honor code for many years. The University of North Carolina is the oldest state institution in the nation and was founded upon principles of strict student conduct. In the early half of the 19th century, Kemp P. Battle reported students being expelled for “firing pistols,” assault, arson, drunkenness, throwing rocks at their tutors, stealing their professor’s horses, and evening dueling. Two groups, the Dialectic and Philanthropic student societies, began to work in conjunction with the

faculty in the 1830's. Trial by the societies was taken more seriously by students who feared more their loss of status as a "gentleman" than expulsion. The University eventually turned over the responsibility for maintaining "a high level of propriety" to the two societies. In 1904, a new student self ruled council, the Student Council, was founded to hear and punish matters of discipline. After the adoption of a student body constitution in 1946, the 1950's and 1960's prompted criticisms and reform and thus the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance was implemented in 1974 ("UNC-CH Student Judicial System http://www.unc.edu/edu/depts/honor/gen_info.html).

The constitution is the foundation for the University's belief in academic and social integrity today. The Code of Student Conduct is divided into the Honor Code and the Campus Code. The Code of Student Conduct states:

The Code of Student Conduct embodies a vital spirit of student life at Carolina: personal conduct should reflect the ideals of integrity and dignity. Student self-governance is an earned privilege and one that should not be taken lightly ("UNC-CH Student Judicial System").

Academic integrity and dignity is the goal of the Code at the University of Chapel Hill. The code not only expresses the importance of academic honor by stating:

It shall be the responsibility of every student at the University of North Carolina at Chapel hill to obey and support the enforcement of the Honor Code, which prohibits lying, cheating, or stealing when these actions involve academic processes or University, student or academic personnel acting in an official capacity (“UNC-CH Student Judicial System”: Instrument of Student Judicial Governance, II.A.),

but also goes further to include social responsibilities as well in the Campus Code which reads:

It shall be the further responsibility of every student to abide by the Campus Code; namely, to conduct oneself so as not to impair significantly the welfare or educational opportunities of others in the University community (“UNC-CH Student Judicial System”: Instrument of Student Judicial Governance, II.B.) (SEE APPENDIX B).

As is the case at most institutions, the Chancellor is ultimately responsible for the judicial system; however, tradition has chosen to delegate the responsibility of “implementing and adjudicating the major aspects of the judicial system” to the students.

The honor code approach allows Carolina students the freedom with an “expectation” that each student will respect his or her “responsibilities” as a member of the University community. The traditional honor system allows for a strong sense of integrity and honor to be extended not only in academic work but also in the conduct of the students socially. The purpose of the honor system is to “set the tone” of academics and the development of students. The University of North Carolina feels that any breach of this code, however small, affects the integrity of the University. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill clearly illustrates the ability for institutions to maintain traditions, yet change when the needs of its campus culture changes.

C. Duke University Honor Code

At Duke University, the honor code is a large part of the institution’s national recognition as a leader in academics. The Honor System at Duke has had an erratic history since its evolution as Union, Normal, and Trinity College beginning in 1838. In those days, the faculty and administration controlled the judicial system and strict punishments were given out to students. The code developed from more of a gentleman’s agreement in the “The General Laws” of Trinity College which stated:

Every student before entering must sign a copy of these laws, thereby pledging his honor as a gentleman to obey them.

The above statement is a typical beginning to modern honor codes that have developed to promote integrity in today's institutions ("The Honor System at Duke University"

http://www.duke.edu/web/Archives/history/honor_system.html).

The Duke code went through many changes throughout its history in which it flourished in the 1920's to being promoted by the women at Duke in the 1940's. The 1950's and 1960's were tainted by opposition to an academic honor code and not until the 1980's was the code revitalized. Most institutions including John Hopkins, Notre Dame, and Barnard were comparable to Duke but gave up during these times because their systems were "not working effectively." Finally in 1982, Duke President Terry Sanford urged the class to develop an honor code at the University. With only twenty-one percent of the vote, the "Duke Honor Commitment" was implemented and an Honor Council formed. There were many problems with the code, and so in 1991 a committee was appointed to study the possibility of a more formal honor code which developed into the current

system. The current honor code stands as a standard for the rest of the country. The code reads:

As a student and citizen of the Duke University Community:

**I will not lie, cheat, or steal in my academic endeavors.*

**I will forthrightly oppose each and every instance of academic dishonesty.*

**I will communicate directly with any person or persons I believe to have been dishonest. Such communication may be oral or written. Written communication may be signed or anonymous.*

**I will give prompt written notification to the appropriate faculty member and the Dean of the College when I observe academic dishonesty in any course.*

**I will let my conscience guide my decision about whether my written report will name the person or persons I believe to have committed a violation of this code.*

I join the undergraduate student body of Duke University in a commitment to this Code of Honor (“The Honor System at Duke University”) (See Appendix C).

Today Duke University is considered to be a success story in a long history of struggles for the implementation of an honor code. Although the honor system found much resistance, under the attention of some very prominent experts in the field, including the Center for Academic Integrity

(CAI), Duke's system has flourished into a strong academic community.

The CAI is a forum of institutions that promotes values of academic integrity among students. The CAI has made its home in affiliation with the Kenan Ethics program at Duke University and is the leading source for information regarding academic integrity and essentials to the success of educating students at institutions of higher learning. Duke has received much publicity and attention due to its commitment to academic integrity and its system has grown through this momentum.

All three of these institutions were chosen because of their similarities to the University of Tennessee by way of geography and size. The University of Virginia and University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill are both excellent examples of how state schools can have a strong academic honor systems, whereas Duke University illustrates the ability of an institution to build a system that can flourish in a modern era.

CASE STUDIES OF MODIFIED HONOR CODES

Perhaps the most exciting findings on academic integrity on college campuses stem from McCabe's (2000) research on a "modified" academic honor code. These surveys are most relevant to the University of Tennessee

because of the greater likelihood of implementing the modified honor code on our campus. Modified codes have flourished on such campuses as the University of Maryland-College Park, Kansas State University, and the University of South Carolina. All of these institutions are similar to the University of Tennessee in that they are large institutions without long-standing honor codes. All of these institutions recently developed an environment that promotes academic integrity; moreover, these schools were able to develop systems that fit their individual needs.

A. University of Maryland Honor Code

The University of Maryland has become the model for many universities that have developed modified honor systems. In 1990, the Campus Senate approved a new “Code of Academic Integrity.” The process began on May 8, 1981, when the Board of Regents adopted a resolution on Academic Integrity stated as the following:

WHEREAS, it is the responsibility of the University of Maryland to maintain integrity in teaching and learning as a fundamental principle on which a university is built; and

WHEREAS, all members of the university community share in the responsibility for academic integrity; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the University of Maryland Board of Regents hereby adopts the following Statement of Faculty, Student and Institutional Rights and Responsibilities for Academic Integrity (University of Maryland Undergraduate Catalog Appendix F) (See Appendix D).

The above resolution was a major step in the development of this system. The Resolution goes on to list the rights and responsibilities of the faculty, students, and institutions. One key in making this a more attractive proposal to be adopted was it in its stating, "...the following statements do not imply a contract between the teacher or the university and the student, they are nevertheless conventions which the university believes to be central to the learning and teaching process (University of Maryland Undergraduate Catalog Appendix F)." The Board of Regents listed the expectations that should come through an adoption of an honor systems. The Board of Regents resolved the following:

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that campuses or appropriate administrative units of the University of Maryland will publish the above Statement of Faculty, Student and Institutional Rights and Responsibilities for Academic Integrity in faculty handbooks and in student handbooks and catalogs; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Regents hereby directs each campus or appropriate administrative unit to review existing procedures or to implement new procedures for carrying out the institutional responsibilities for academic integrity cited in the above Statement; and

***BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Board of Regents hereby direct each campus or appropriate administrative unit to submit to the President or designee for approval of the campus' or units' procedure for implementation of the institutional responsibility provisions of the above Statement (University of Maryland Undergraduate Catalog Appendix F
www.inform.umd.edu/CampusInfo/Departments/JPO/code_acinteg2a.html).***

The Board of Regents had enough foresight to promote this on a state level and allow for each campus to individualize its own systems.

The University of Maryland followed suit and began to develop a program to promote academic integrity. The explanation of the system by the Campus Senate states that, "Because the University is an academic community in which commitment to the principles of truth and academic honesty are essential, the Code of Academic Integrity prohibits students from committing the following acts:

- 1. Cheating: intentionally using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise.***
- 2. Fabrication: intentional and unauthorized falsification or invention of any information or citation in any academic exercise.***

3. ***Facilitating academic dishonesty: intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting to help another violate any provision of (the Academic) code.***
4. ***Plagiarism: intentionally or knowingly representing the words or ideas of another as one's own in any academic integrity***
(www.inform.umd.edu/CampusInfo/Departments/JPO/code_acinteg2a.html)."

The code goes on to charge the responsibility of its maintenance through a student Honor Council. The Honor council is to investigate and resolve charges of academic dishonesty, as well as promote the values of personal and academic integrity. The students are appointed to the Honor Council by each College, the Graduate School, and a committee consisting of the President of the Student Government Association, the Chair of Graduate Student Government, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Vice President for Student Affairs. This provides input for the successful continuation of the code. The faculty, students and campus administration are all represented, yet the honor code allows the students the ultimate responsibility of carrying out its purpose. By gaining input from all areas of the academic community, this system is able to maintain a high reputation (www.inform.umd.edu/EdREs/FacRes/FacHandbook/vol11/code-acad-integ.html).

One interesting aspect of the Maryland system involves the sanctions of academic dishonesty. The Academic Code stipulates that the grade of "XF"

may be sanctioned in such cases. This grade records an act lacking integrity, and it is recorded on the transcripts of students found responsible for violations with the notation “failure due to academic dishonesty.” Provisions are made for students to petition the Honor Council to remove the grade of “XF” and replace it with the grade of “F” if particular conditions have been satisfied

(www.inform.umd.edu/EdREs/FacRes/FacHandbook/vol11/code-acad-integ.html).

The Honor Council may also recommend other penalties, such as suspension or expulsion, in cases which warrant those sanctions. One student said the policy showed the University’s commitment to “not selling us out,” by providing opportunities to expunge their records of the academic dishonesty. The student can take a one hour academic integrity seminar that will replace the “X”. This type of record on a transcript, unlike the automatic dismissal process, allows for a “fact-finding” search to take place. This is important for the institution’s knowledge of “why cheating takes place (“Our code to live by” 1999).”

Another important feature of the honor code that illustrates its effectiveness is the outline provided to the faculty concerning “tips” for heightening awareness. The University of Maryland urges faculty to speak

at the first class session of the “university standards and their own intolerance of academic dishonesty.” All professors are asked to include the University’s academic integrity policies and the instructor's intentions to abide by these rules on the course syllabus. The syllabus is not a legal document; however, it does raise the awareness in the students and the expectations within the classroom setting.

The University of Maryland demonstrates the effectiveness of a type of modified system that could be adopted on our campus. On March 12, 1999, Campus Director of Judicial Programs Gary Pavela spoke to the College Park Senate about academic integrity both on campuses and campuses across the nation. Pavela said, “Each side develops their measures and counter measures...it’s us against them.” Pavela felt that in an absence of an honor code the environment pitted teachers against students. He went on to say that only an honor code could “break down these barriers” between faculty and students (Pompi 1999).

The Diamondback, the independent student newspaper at the University of Maryland, assesses the effectiveness of the honor system in a March, 1999 article. The editorial defined the honor system as a “little thing” that finds its effectiveness in the continual reminders in the form of literature,

orientation materials, and class discussions. On campus, the code “seems like a forgotten or downplayed part of our academic lives,” yet “plays a quiet and vital role in our lives here at campus (“Our code to live by” 1999).”

A. Kansas State University Honor Code

Kansas State University has developed a code based upon the successful modified honor code at the University of Maryland. In 1996, several members of the Provost Task Force on Academic Honesty expressed concern with the existing judicial process for handling cases of academic dishonesty. The Task Force urged that the code “create a positive environment on campus that will promote the concepts of academic honesty and integrity.” The Task Force went on to describe the code as a “foundation for a new community of trust that will develop among members of the academic community.” The honor code is defined as “an assumption of trust which accompanies the student in all dealings with fellow students, faculty, and administrators.” The code also states the importance of “individual responsibility” that is “essential to a community of trust.” The Kansas State Honor code states:

- A. *That as K-State students, they will not give or receive aid in examinations; that they will not give or receive unpermitted aid in class work, in the preparation of reports or in any other work that is to be used by the instructor as the basis of grading.*
- B. *That as K-State students, they will do their share and take an active part in seeing to it that others as well as themselves uphold the spirit and letter of the Honor System. This includes reporting an observed dishonesty.*

The Honor Pledge Statement

On all course work, assignments, or examinations done by students at Kansas State University, the following pledge is either required or implied:

On my honor as a student I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this assignment.

This statement means that the student understands and has complied with the requirements of the assignment as set forth by the instructor ("Undergraduate Honor System-Kansas State" 1998 www.ksu.edu/ns-search/facsen/policy/honorcode.html) (See Appendix E).

The honor code at Kansas State does not “compel” students to report acts but encourages them. Much like other codes around the country, the Kansas State honor code is managed by a new Honor Council, comprised of both students and faculty appointed by their peers. The new Honor Council

hears cases of academic dishonesty, but grade appeals and other behavioral breaches are handled by existing Kansas State offices. The faculty is required to file a record with the Honor Council on the act that was termed “academically dishonest” and how the violation was handled. Any appeals by the student on this type of academic issue is then heard by the Honor Council. The criteria for determining a breach are the following:

- A. Did a breach of academic honesty occur?**
- B. What was the level of intent during the act?**
- C. What was the seriousness of the act? Would acceptance of the act seriously erode the integrity of KSU’s honor system?**

The Student Governing Association also provides and revises a “Conduct Code” which denotes all forms of misconduct on campus, including academic dishonesty. The Honor Council is also required to educate students and faculty regarding potential honor code violations and honor issues (“**Undergraduate Honor System-Kansas State**” 1998).

Another key to the success of this code may be attributed the management of the system through a Director of Honor Systems and Related Judicial affairs. An administrator who functions with the Provost’s authority is charged to manage the system. This member of the

administration can bring continuity, equity, and improved management.

The director serves as an ex officio member of the Honor Council. Having input by administration provides constant “care and feeding” of the system ("Undergraduate Honor System-Kansas State" 1998).

C. University of South Carolina Honor Code

The University of South Carolina has developed something quite different from the typical honor code. In 1989, a committee was assembled of faculty, staff, and students to study the apparently growing number of “crimes and bias related incidents on campuses across the country.” The group was concerned with the likelihood of similar acts taking place on the campus at USC. They “realized that relationships are influenced by cultures and noted that people learn a lot about how to treat one another (in college), but some of what they learn is not what we intend to teach ("USC Celebrates Creed Week" 1996). The committee was looking for a way to clarify a set of values and standards that could be promoted and maintained by the entire campus body. To be sure to not only provide values of the committee members, drafts were subjected to empirical content analysis techniques and compared to USC’s mission statement. Much like the University of Tennessee, USC had to send its final draft through a series of

approvals such as the Student Senate, the Faculty Senate and the Board of Trustees. After all groups endorsed the draft, it became an official University document ("USC Celebrates Creed Week" 1996).

The charge of this committee was to develop a "Carolinian Creed." This document would be a "summary of values," "a statement of principles," and "a statement of standards to govern relationships in the community." The honor creed would complement the already established University conduct code, but would focus more on what is expected of the University community rather than merely focusing on restrictive acts. This Creed would be set in place to use as a "tool of instruction" of values and ethics. The Carolinian Creed reads:

As a Carolinian...

-I will practice personal and academic integrity;

-I will respect the dignity of all persons;

-I will respect the rights and property of others;

-I will discourage bigotry, striving to learn from differences in people, ideas and opinions;

-I will demonstrate concern for others, their feelings and their need for conditions which support their work and development.

Allegiance to these ideals obligates each student to refrain from and discourage behaviors which threaten the freedom and respect all USC community members deserve (See Appendix F).

This Creed attempted to “reduce offensive behavior and expression many colleges and universities wrote with new regulations and ‘speech codes’.” Many felt that people’s attitudes and conduct were effected by more than rules. The Creed would support common ideals such as dignity, respect, tolerance, and compassion they thought proclaiming a “commitment to these often and widely might challenge to always show others the respect and regard they deserve (“USC Celebrates Creed Week” 1996).”

The University of South Carolina put in place an intangible source of community values that could be promoted on a large college campus. At a convocation ceremony in October 1990, the University of South Carolina introduced and adopted the Carolinian Creed.

Administration, faculty, the Board of Trustees, and students assembled on the Horseshoe on campus and promised to make its “lofty ideals real.” This type of ceremony began a reaction that would sweep across the campus culture in Columbia, South Carolina. In March of 1996, the University celebrated a “creed week” in which T-shirts, literature, and forums educated the campus community on the Creed’s purpose. This Creed has been

promoted and ceremonially brought to the forefront of every member of the University.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE HONOR CODE

The University of Tennessee has not been totally immune to pursuits to promote academic integrity. Though the system has not had a “formal” honor system, many attempts have been made to begin a tradition of academic integrity. Pushes by the Undergraduate Academic Council and a masters thesis have been completed on the topic of academic integrity and higher education discipline that relate to this study of honor codes and ethics.

One push for an honor code at the University of Tennessee occurred in the mid-1980’s under the direction of the Undergraduate Academic Council. In October of 1984, the Council proposed a study for the possible implementation of an honor code on campus. This proposal was prompted by the increasing number of academic dishonesty cases that were referred to the Office of Student Conduct. One hundred and sixty-six cases were sent to this office in 1984, compared to one hundred and thirty-three in 1983, eighty cases in 1982, and fifty-six cases in 1981 (Martin 1984a).

Rather than attempt to develop a “quick fix” of the matter and implement an honor system right away, then Assistant Dean Tim Rogers advised the Undergraduate Academic Council to study types of honor codes across the country. If it looked feasible, he advised that they then attempt to adopt an honor code at the University of Tennessee. Many academic colleges at UT had contemplated instituting honor codes, but this would cause chaos among the entire academic community. If students were to change from one college to another, this could cause confusion with the students and faculty, not to mention the loads of paperwork that would be necessary to regulate each separate case. Many felt that the only true way to implement academic integrity on the University of Tennessee campus was with a campus-wide honor code. Assistant Dean Rogers felt that, “We don’t do a good job telling students our (teachers’) expectations (Martin 1984a).”

The UAC began to hear debate concerning the issue of an honor code from students at its November meeting. Strong opposition to the code came from groups such as the college of Engineering. One UT student said, “If UT puts ‘do not cheat’ on everything, counterproductive reasoning will result. It makes the university sound like it is a school full of cheaters (Martin 1984b).” Yet others voiced opinions that an honor system would be

a positive addition to our campus. Warren Neel, then Dean of the College of Business Administration, spoke in favor of the university-wide honor code rather than allowing each college to maintain its own system; “To leave it to each department will not say to the public or to ourselves that this is something we hold high. The time has come that the quality of education does not rest solely on the backs of the faculty and administration. It rests with you [the student] (Martin 1984b).” The words of Randy Padawer, a psychology major, illustrated that many students supported the code when he said, “Somebody will always cheat and get away with it, but an honor code won’t encourage cheating and it may even discourage it (Martin 1984b).”

Undergraduate Academic Council chairperson Michele Walker set this topic as an agenda item for that body for the 1984-1985 school year. The UAC began to study other institutions including Southern Methodist University (SMU) and Texas A&M. SMU’s system featured an honor council that relied upon a manual to determine conditions of cheating while Texas A&M explicitly defined cheating and included guidelines on plagiarism, conspiracy, and falsification. Walker did not attempt to model a system after only one university, but to combine aspects of many systems

that would compliment the University of Tennessee campus (Wickert 1985).

The main focus of debate was the absence of **affirmative duty** which would require students to report witnessed cases of academic dishonesty. The other controversy concerned **single sanction**, which requires the same punishment for everyone caught violating the statement. The statement that was finally adopted by the UAC did not include these things, but did require students to be responsible for helping enforce the statement. This statement would require students to sign the statement before being admitted into UT and before taking exams. The UAC realized that the system was set in place to deal with matters of academic integrity, yet no actual honor code was at the forefront of its effectiveness. Many sources believe that the code lost its momentum due to personalities involved in the failed attempt. The honor statement, though it lost much awareness and was even dropped, eventually found some contribution to the University and is outlined on page 31 of [Hilltopics](#).

The University of Tennessee also has a process that contends with matters through an Academic Review Board which was charged with three responsibilities:

- **The Board must determine by a two thirds majority if a student did cheat.**
- **If the board decides that cheating did in fact occur, it decides if the penalty is appropriate for the offense.**
- **The third aspect involves disciplinary sanction. The board can place the student under probation or suspension.**

The Academic Review Board consists of three students and three faculty along with the non-voting Assistant Dean of Student Conduct, who chairs the committee. There are thirteen Academic Review Boards to hear such matters, one from each individual undergraduate college as well as the College of Law, the Graduate school, and the college of Veterinary Medicine (Hilltopics). *1

In the late 1990's, another individual attempted to look at the current code that the University of Tennessee had in place by her development of a masters thesis. The thesis was composed by Deborah Smith, a masters student in College Student Personnel at the University of Tennessee, entitled The Honor Statement and Student Attitudes towards Cheating at the University of Tennessee in 1997. This recent survey attempts to find students' input on academic integrity and more specifically honor codes.

*1: An attempt was made to research the University of Tennessee's files on academic honor codes. Unfortunately, the files cannot be found. The lost files would allow for many gaps in the above research to be complete.

This study is important in that it surveys the effects exposure to academic integrity has upon students.

Smith began by randomly selecting two sections of a Chemistry course at the beginning of the fall semester in 1996 at the University of Tennessee. Chemistry was chosen by Smith because of the difficulty of the course and the relative ease at which the students would be able to cheat on laboratory reports and exams. Smith also became aware, through discussions with Chemistry professors, that there had been many cheating attempts by former students. A total of 156 students were surveyed in this experiment including 84 students in the control group and 72 students in the treatment group.

These students completed a questionnaire entitled “Attitude Toward Cheating” (ATC) in a pretest and a posttest. This test was developed by William Gardner and Kenneth Melvin (1988) (qtd. in Smith 1997, 20) and has been proven valid through other studies on similar issues concerning academic integrity. These students took the test through the Likert scale responses: strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree. Both sets of students were read the honor statement that we currently have at the University of Tennessee:

An essential feature of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville is a commitment to maintaining an atmosphere of intellectual integrity and academic honesty. As a student of the University, I pledge that I will neither knowingly give nor receive any inappropriate assistance in academic work, thus affirming my own personal commitment to honor and integrity (Hilltopics) (See Appendix G).

Throughout the entire semester students in the treatment group were familiarized with the honor statement. The honor statement was printed on a paper attached to every examinations administered during the semester. Students had to sign the code and turn in the signed code along with the exams. The control group received no reminder of the honor statement of the University of Tennessee. The students were then given the ATC test once again at the end of the semester (Smith 1997).

The concluding findings of this study were statistically inconclusive according to Smith, yet a “small but positive” response to the treatment did occur in the group that was exposed to the honor statement (Smith 1997, 29). According to Smith the main “...component in this study was the **communication** of the honor system to the students (Smith 1997, 29).” The honor statement is accessible to all students in the admissions application, student handbook, honors handbook, and at summer Orientation. Though these documents are available to all students, the “constant reiteration that

the statement exists, and the constant reiteration of what the statement means, and the constant encouragement to adhere to the statement's philosophy," according to Smith's study, is a more "aggressive means of reinforcing the honor statement (Smith 1997, 29-30). " Also, the topic of punishment can be considered important as well in determining the factors to promote academic integrity and dissuade others from cheating. Smith came to the ultimate conclusion that only a "strong internalized code of ethics" is effective in controlling academic dishonesty. Smith states the following theory from research in moral development by Lawrence Kohlberg:

The reason the good can be taught is because we know it all along dimly or at a low level and its teaching is more a calling out than an instruction.

The reason we think the good cannot be taught is because the same good is known differently at different levels and direct instruction cannot take place across levels.

Then the teaching of virtue is the asking of questions and the pointing of the way, not the giving of answers. Moral education is the leading of men upward, not the putting into the mind of knowledge that was not there before (qtd. in Smith 1997, 31).

Smith believes that "for students to be able to make moral decisions their moral reasoning skill must be developed first by being challenged with moral conflict situations. Then, new modes of thought and possible

solutions must be presented and discussed exposing a higher level of moral reasoning. In this way, students will be better prepared to deal with moral dilemmas (Smith 1997, 31-32).” This view provides an interesting perspective in the quest for the University of Tennessee to communicate through the faculty and staff the moral obligations of every member of the campus community. By promoting the importance of honesty, ethics, and academic integrity, the academic community can begin to “internalize” values by the individual and the University (Smith 1997, 32).

In January 2000 the Undergraduate Academic Council attempted to pass a set of ethical codes termed the “Tennessee Tenets.” This was a document designed to increase awareness of ethical behaviors and academic integrity on our campus. The committee developed a set of ethical values, but it has yet to be formally adopted on the University of Tennessee campus. The “Tennessee Tenets” clearly illustrate the issue of academic and personal integrity is an important aspect of our student’s expectations of an education and experience on the University of Tennessee campus. Along with this thesis, the “Tennets” is a great starting point to open dialogue concerning these actions and may even prove to become a part of our campus culture.

An honor statement faces a variety of obstacles in implementation including student support, faculty support, and the eventual approval by the Board of Trustees. This process takes up to two years for implementation and will need legislative approval. This tedious process has caused many past attempts on our campus to seem feeble, and lack the perseverance that is required to implement such a plan. The final aspect of its implementation relies upon the need of such a system. Is academic integrity lacking on the University of Tennessee campus, and even with a code, would it be effective?

NEED AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

Through careful consideration and substantial evidence, it is my conclusion that academic integrity should be improved on our campus. With over seventy-five percent of undergraduate students cheating on college campuses and twenty percent admitting to more than three incidents on exams, academic dishonesty is a problem effecting our campus. It is something that I have personally witnessed on a daily basis! Because of its commonality, I have been tempted to involve myself in cheating during my tenure here at the University of Tennessee. Cheating is a norm that has

developed on our campus because of many of the same pressures and factors discussed in this thesis. Students are worried about falling behind other students, concerned with grades, and the competition of gaining admittance into graduate programs.

This thesis concludes that the honor statement at the University of Tennessee is not the problem, but the problem lies within the "honor system." The wording of the statement is not the aspect of our current system that is lacking effectiveness; however, it is the communication and execution of such a statement. Because the statement was developed by students, faculty, and administration, there are many benefits of maintaining the traditions the statement has instilled on our campus. The statement is already in place; we only need to fix the system.

We are not the only campus that is suffering from this trend; as McCabe points out, academic dishonesty is effecting many campuses across the nation. Not many people debate the fact that cheating, plagiarism, and academic dishonesty take place on the University of Tennessee campus. The debate ends with the question, "How do we combat it?"

Though cheating is not a topic that has a simple solution, it is one that can be combated. According to my research outlined in this study,

the most effective way to curb cheating on a college campus is through the development of an honor system. As mentioned, only fifty-seven percent of students on strong honor code campuses reported incidents of cheating.

Recent studies on large campuses ("New Research on Academic Integrity" 2000) further exemplify the effectiveness of honor codes at large state institutions. Examples of honor codes at the University of Maryland, Kansas State University, and the University of South Carolina illustrate a means of promoting academic integrity. According to McCabe's survey, where large modified honor codes exist, only ten percent of students reported cases of serious cheating, while seventeen percent reported cases on large public universities without honor codes.

CONCLUSION

Because the University of Tennessee is a large public institution and has serious problems with academic dishonesty, it is my conclusion that a modified honor code would be most effective in deterring cheating on our campus. A modified honor code has proven to be accepted by institutions similar to ours and has effected positively the levels of academic integrity. A modified honor code allows the University of Tennessee to develop a

code that meets the individual needs of our institution, be incorporated into the current judiciary process, and be implemented in a timely matter. Through ceremonial promotions at Torch Night, discussions in class, expectations stated in documents, and an acceptance by all members of this campus community, an honor system could be a dominant factor in promoting academic excellence. With organizations such as the Center for Academic Integrity, the Josephson Institute, and the John Templeton Foundation, support is available.

We have an honor statement in place, yet it has not been effective. The purpose of this study is not to attempt the Herculean task of developing a perfect modified honor code, nor is it to set the path for implementing a system to combat academic dishonesty; however it does question the manner in which the honor statement is currently being communicated to our campus. With only a few improvements in publicizing the honor code, the University of Tennessee has the opportunity to develop an improved atmosphere of academic integrity.

A modified honor system could send a message to legislators and to all the citizens of the state that we, as a university, are committed to academic excellence. Such a movement could demonstrate that our

university is serious about becoming a top twenty-five public research institute, as outlined by President J. Wade Gilley. The development of an honor code could quiet concerns that we are merely a “football school” with no ethical standards. An honor system could positively affect the morale on campus and causing a chain reaction of positive publicity for our University. But most importantly, the simple statement of an honor code could reassure graduating seniors who walk across the stage to receive their diplomas that they attended and graduated from an institution that instills integrity, hard work, and excellence.

Sir Winston Churchill once stated, “The price of greatness is responsibility.” The time has come for the University of Tennessee to accept the responsibility of academic excellence and integrity. Let us all take the initial step and make the University of Tennessee an exemplary institution.

APPENDIX A

THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA HONOR CODE

University of Virginia students have entered into an agreement, embodied in the Honor System, that they shall not tolerate lying, cheating, or stealing from their fellow students. In addition, all students have agreed to conduct themselves in accordance with the spirit of the Honor System in Charlottesville and Albemarle County, and whenever they present themselves as University students to induce reliance. Students are thus presumed to be honorable unless their actions prove otherwise.

Students who violate this spirit of mutual trust have committed an offense against the community. Hence, their continued residence at the University would undermine the basis of this community which holds that personal fulfillment is best achieved in an atmosphere where only honest means are used to achieve any ends. In the event of a guilty verdict, the student is denied further membership in the University community and is not entitled to hold or receive a degree from the University of Virginia.

Recommendation is made to the General Faculty to revoke degrees awarded students who have breached the Honor Code during their tenure as a student. Each student generation must ensure that the system covers only those offenses which are intolerable to their community. Indeed, the Honor System has undergone many changes since its establishment in 1842, in an effort to maintain its viability as a norm of conduct characterizing life at the University.

The Honor System is the finest example of student self-governance at the University. It demands a commitment from every student to the ideal which forms the very basis of the system. A thorough understanding of the system is an essential part of every student's matriculation.

APPENDIX B

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA-CHAPEL HILL HONOR CODE

The Code of Student Conduct

Honor Code:

It shall be the responsibility of every student at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill to obey and to support the enforcement of the Honor Code which prohibits lying, cheating, or stealing when these actions involve academic processes or University, student or Academic personnel acting in an official capacity.

Campus Code:

It shall be the further responsibility of every student to abide by the Campus Code; namely, to conduct oneself so as not to impair significantly the welfare or the educational opportunities of others in the University community.

The Instrument of Student Judicial Governance

The *Instrument* is the comprehensive and authoritative document describing judicial self-governance at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. It defines offenses of the Code of Student Conduct, the punitive measures to be associated with such offenses, and definite procedures for responding to alleged violations

APPENDIX C

DUKE UNIVERSITY HONOR CODE

Undergraduate Honor Code

As a student and citizen of the Duke University Community:

- I will not lie, cheat, or steal in my academic endeavors.
- I will forthrightly oppose each and every instance of academic dishonesty.
- I will communicate directly with any persons I believe to have been dishonest. Such communication may be oral or written. Written communication may be signed or anonymous.
- I will give prompt and written notification to the appropriate faculty and the Dean of Trinity College or the Dean of the School of Engineering when I observe academic dishonesty in any course.
- I will let my conscience guide my decision about whether my written report will name the person or persons I believe to have committed a violation of this Code.

I will join the undergraduate student body of Duke University in a commitment to this Code of Honor.

APPENDIX D

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND-COLLEGE PARK HONOR CODE

Resolution on Academic Integrity

*Approved by Board of Regents
May 8, 1981*

WHEREAS, it is the responsibility of the University of Maryland to maintain integrity in teaching and learning as a fundamental principle on which a university is built; and

WHEREAS, all members of the university community share in the responsibility for academic integrity; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the University of Maryland Board of Regents hereby adopts the following Statement of Faculty, Student and Institutional Rights and Responsibilities for Academic Integrity.

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that campuses or appropriate administrative units of the University of Maryland will publish the above Statement of Faculty, Student and Institutional Rights and Responsibilities for Academic Integrity in faculty handbooks and in student handbooks and catalogs; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Regents hereby directs each campus or appropriate administrative unit to review existing procedures or to implement new procedures for carrying out the institutional responsibilities for academic integrity cited in the above Statement; and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Board of Regents hereby directs each campus or appropriate administrative unit to submit to the President or designee for approval the campus' or unit's procedure for implementation of the institutional responsibility provisions of the above Statement.

APPENDIX E

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY HONOR CODE

Beginning Fall semester 1999, Kansas State University initiated an Undergraduate Honor System based on personal integrity which is presumed to be sufficient assurance that in academic matters one's work is performed honestly and without unauthorized assistance.

Undergraduate students, by registration, acknowledge the jurisdiction of the Undergraduate Honor System. The policies and procedures of the Undergraduate Honor System apply to all full and part-time students enrolled in undergraduate courses on-campus, off-campus, and via distance learning.

A prominent part of the Honor System is the inclusion of the Honor Pledge which applies to all assignments, examinations, or other course work undertaken by undergraduate students. The Honor Pledge is implied, whether or not it is stated:

"On my honor, as a student, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this academic work."

APPENDIX F

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA HONOR CODE

The Carolinian Creed

The University of scholars at the University of South Carolina is dedicated to personal and academic excellence.

Choosing to join the community obligates each member to a code of civilized behavior.

As a Carolinian...

I will practice personal and academic integrity;

I will respect the dignity of all persons;

I will respect the rights and property of others;

I will discourage bigotry, while striving to learn from differences in people, ideas and opinions;

I will demonstrate concern for others, their feelings, and their need for conditions which support their work and development.

Allegiance of these ideals requires each Carolinian to refrain from and discourage behaviors which threaten the freedom and respect every individual deserves.

APPENDIX G

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

THE HONOR STATEMENT

An essential feature of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, is a commitment to maintaining an atmosphere of intellectual integrity and academic honesty. As a student of the University, I pledge that I will neither knowingly give nor receive any inappropriate assistance in academic work, thus affirming my own personal commitment to honor and integrity.

WORKS CITED

- "Academic Cheating Background." Educational Testing Service. November 1998.
[<http://www.nocheating.org/adccouncil/research/cheatingbackgrounder>].
- Bowers, W.J. (1964). Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College. New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research. Columbia University.
- CAI. Duke University: The Center for Academic Integrity, 1997.
[<http://www.academicintegrity.org>].
- Hilltopics. University of Tennessee Handbook. 1999.
- "Honor Committee Constitution-UVA." [<http://scs.student.Virginia.EDU/~honor>].
- "The Honor System at Duke University." May 2000.
[http://www.duke.edu/web/Archives/history/honor_system.html].
- "The Josephson Institute." May 24, 2000. [<http://www.josephsoninstitute.org>].
- Martin, Karen. 1994a. "Honor Code May Be Adopted." The Daily Beacon. University of Tennessee. October 18, 1984. Vol. 38, No. 22.
- Martin, Karen. 1994b. "Council Looks at Honor Code; hears debates." The Daily Beacon. University of Tennessee. November 19, 1984. Vol. 38, No. 43.
- McCabe, D.L. & Trevino, L.K. (1993). "Academic Dishonesty: Honor Codes and Other Contextual Influences." Journal of Higher Education, 64, 522-538.
- McCabe, D.L. (1993). "Faculty Responses to Academic Dishonesty. The Influence of Student Honor Codes." Research in Higher Education, 35, 647-658.
- McCabe, D.L. (1999). "Study Reveals Honor Codes Meeting with Success in Combating High Levels of Student Cheating." Rutgers University. Press Release, February 15, 2000.
- "New Research on Academic Integrity." College Administration Publications, Inc. June 29, 2000. [<http://www.collegepubs.com/ref/SFX000515>].
- "Our Code to Live By." The Diamondback. University of Maryland-College Park. March 12, 1999. P. 7.
- Pompi, Jennifer. "Academic Dishonesty Rising at Universities." The Diamondback. University of Maryland-College Park. March 12, 1999.

Smith, Deborah. The Honor Statement and Student Attitudes Towards Cheating at the University of Tennessee. Masters Thesis. University of Tennessee, 1997.

"UNC-CH Student Judicial System." May 2000.
[http://www.unc.edu/edu/depts/honor/gen_info.html],

"Undergraduate Honor System-Kansas State." April 14, 1998.
[www.ksu.edu/ns-search/facsen/policy/honorcode.html],

University of Maryland Undergraduate Catalog. May 2000.
[[www.inform.umd.edu/CampusInfo/Departments/JPO/code acinteg2a.html](http://www.inform.umd.edu/CampusInfo/Departments/JPO/code/acinteg2a.html)],

"USC Celebrates Creed Week." University of South Carolina Press Release. March 25, 1996.

Weiss, Kenneth R. "Focus on Ethics Can Curb Cheating, Colleges Find." Los Angeles Times. February 15, 2000, A17.

Wickert, David. "Honor code hunt starts." The Daily Beacon. The University of Tennessee. January 24, 1985. Vol. 39, No. 2.