

HONOR CODE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Table of Contents

A. About the Honor Code	2
1. Principle.....	2
2. Purpose.....	2
3. Authority to Establish the Honor Code	2
4. Jurisdiction of the Honor Code.....	2
5. Signing of the Code.....	2
6. Violations of the Honor Code.....	2
7. Definitions	2
a. Academic Dishonesty	
b. Faculty	
c. Academic Sanctions	
d. Non-Academic Sanctions	
e. Acceptance of Responsibility	
f. Denial of Responsibility	
8. Faculty Support.....	4
9. Confidentiality of Honor Code Proceedings and Record Keeping	4
B. Honor Code Bodies	4
1. Campus Ethics Committee.....	4
2. Honor Code Council.....	5
3. Hearing Panel Pool	6
4. Hearing Panel	7
5. Appeals Board	7
C. Procedures for Case Resolution.....	7
1. Time Period for Referral of Suspected Violations.....	7
2. Notification to Honor Code Council.....	7
a. Submission of Forms	
b. Faculty Referral Forms	
c. Student Referral Forms	
3. Reporting of Violations	8
a. Student Procedures	
b. Faculty Procedures	
4. Initial Contact	8
5. Signing of the Case Resolution Preference Form	8
a. Acceptance of Responsibility	
b. Denial of Responsibility	
6. Investigation of Disputed Accusations	9
7. Notice of Hearing	9
8. Advisors and Witnesses.....	10
9. Hearing Process.....	10
a. General	
b. Hearing Procedure	
10. Information Standard in Hearing Process.....	11
11. Finding of Responsibility through Hearing Process	11
12. Sanctioning	11
13. Notification of Decision	12
14. Appeals.....	12
15. Non-Academic Sanction Reviews	12
16. Dismissal or Withdrawal.....	13
D. Revisions of the Honor Code Policies and Procedures	13

A. About the Honor Code

1. Principle
 - a. Academic integrity is a commitment to five fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility. From these values flow principles of behavior that enable academic communities to translate ideals into action (The Center for Academic Integrity*).
2. Purpose
 - a. The purpose of the Honor Code at the University of Colorado Boulder is to secure an environment where academic integrity can flourish. The Honor Code recognizes the importance of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility and aims to instill these principles as essential features of the University of Colorado Boulder campus. The Honor Code allows all students to have responsibility for, and the ability to attain, appropriate recognition for their academic and personal achievements. Research indicates that student-run Honor Code institutions are highly successful in preventing violations and promoting an academically honorable community.
3. Authority to Establish the Honor Code
 - a. The Honor Code is authorized by the Board of Regents and the Chancellor of the University of Colorado Boulder. It was developed with the assistance of faculty from the Boulder Faculty Assembly, the Academic Ethics Chairs, and the individual schools and colleges. The Honor Code was approved by a vote of the student population in November of 2000, followed by a vote of the Boulder Faculty Assembly, and a vote by faculty members in the individual colleges and schools on the Boulder campus.
4. Jurisdiction of the Honor Code
 - a. All students of the University of Colorado Boulder enrolled in credit or non-credit classes are subject to the Honor Code for academic matters. The jurisdiction of the Honor Code includes, but is not limited to, the University of Colorado Boulder Campus, Continuing Education programs, and Study Abroad programs.
 - b. The Honor Code Council and the Campus Ethics Committee will work closely with the individual schools and colleges to promote academic integrity on a campus-wide basis.
 - c. As part of its role to prepare students for a self-regulating profession, the University of Colorado School of Law will maintain, administer, and implement its long-standing Honor Code, and will submit all records pertaining to violations to the Honor Code Office.
 - d. An Honor Code proceeding does not necessarily preclude other campus disciplinary proceedings, if the alleged conduct potentially violates another campus policy or policies.
5. Signing of the Code
 - a. Students will be required to sign a statement agreeing to abide by all university policies, including the Honor Code, on their application, as a condition of admission to University of Colorado Boulder.
 - b. All incoming students will be given the opportunity to participate in an Honor Code educational session.
6. Violations of the Honor Code
 - a. Violations of the Honor Code include any act of academic dishonesty as defined in Section A.7.a.
7. Definitions
 - a. Academic Dishonesty: Any act in which a student gains, or attempts to gain, an unfair academic advantage over other students. These acts may include, but are not limited to:

* The Center for Academic Integrity is based at Duke University and is devoted to the fundamental principles of academic integrity that are innate in honor codes: “The Center for Academic Integrity provides a forum to identify, affirm, and promote the values of academic integrity among students” www.academicintegrity.org.

- i. Plagiarism: Portrayal of another's work or ideas as one's own
 - ii. Cheating: Using prohibited notes or study aids, allowing another party to do one's work/exam and turning in that work/exam as one's own, copying another student's course work, and collaborating on course work when prohibited
 - iii. Fabrication: Falsification or creation of data, research, or resources, altering a graded work without the prior consent of the course instructor
 - iv. Lying: Deliberate falsification with the intent to deceive in written or verbal form as applied to an academic submission
 - v. Bribery: Providing, offering, or taking rewards in exchange for a grade, or, an assignment, or in the aid of Academic Dishonesty
 - vi. Threat: An attempt to intimidate a student, staff, or faculty member for the purpose of receiving an unearned grade or in an effort to prevent the reporting of an Honor Code violation, or in connection with any other form of Academic Dishonesty
 - vii. Unauthorized Access: Gaining unauthorized access to protected academic information including, but not limited to: the Integrated Student Information System (ISIS); a faculty member's computer, files, and/or office; or secure information on an online server
 - viii. Clicker Fraud: Using, or having someone else use, clicker technology fraudulently in an effort to receive academic credit.
 - ix. Resubmission: Submitting the same or similar work in more than one course without permission from all course instructors involved
 - x. Aiding Academic Dishonesty: Intentionally facilitating any act which may help a student to gain an unfair academic advantage including, but not limited to, any of the aforementioned acts.
- b. Faculty: All references to faculty include, but are not limited to: Deans, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, Research Professors, Senior Instructors, Instructors, Lecturers, Adjunct Faculty, Graduate Teaching Assistants, Graduate Part-time Instructors, and Undergraduate Teaching Assistants.
 - c. Academic Sanctions: Academic Sanctions are applied exclusively by faculty, not by the Director of Adjudication, Hearing Panels or Appeals Boards. Academic Sanctions may include assigning assignment grades, assigning course grades, and requiring additional assignments.
 - d. Non-Academic Sanctions: Non-Academic Sanctions are issued by the Director of Adjudication, Hearing Panels, and/or Appeals Boards upon the finding of an Honor Code violation. Non-Academic Sanctions for violations of the Honor Code include, but are not limited to:
 - i. Recommendation for Expulsion (with automatic transcript notation) (as provided in Section C.11.c.)
 - ii. Recommendation for Suspension (with automatic transcript notation for the period of suspension) (as provided in Section C.11.c.)
 - iii. Honor Code Probation

- iv. Academic Ethics Seminar
 - v. Writing Seminar
 - vi. Educational/Skill Building Workshops
 - vii. Community Service
 - viii. Reflection Paper
 - ix. Letter of Warning
- e. Acceptance of Responsibility: A student accepts responsibility when the student generally accepts as true the allegations that constitute one or more of the forms of Academic Dishonesty. Acceptance of Responsibility does not preclude the student the opportunity to present mitigating circumstances relating to the student's conduct.
- f. Denial of Responsibility: A student denies responsibility when the student denies that the allegations constitute one or more forms of academic dishonesty either in whole or in part. Denial of Responsibility will result in a formal Honor Code investigation and hearing processes.
8. Faculty Support
- a. Faculty are expected to support and promote academic integrity and honor within their classrooms. They are encouraged to refer to the Honor Code on all pertinent materials including syllabi, tests, and other assignments. Faculty are encouraged to discuss the Honor Code periodically in class as it applies to their courses.
9. Confidentiality of Honor Code Proceedings and Records
- a. Honor Code proceedings are confidential pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). All persons who participate in Honor Code proceedings shall be informed of this confidentiality requirement.
 - b. All members of the Honor Code Council and Hearing Panel Pool must sign a confidentiality agreement upon taking office. Any breach of the confidentiality of Honor Code proceedings will result in automatic removal from the Honor Code Council or Hearing Panel Pool, and may result in other appropriate action. Student Conduct action for Councilmembers and Hearing Panelists shall commence based on University Standard of Conduct 9: *Violating any university policy or regulation while on university premises.*
 - c. Honor Code records are maintained as follows, with each time period measured from the conclusion of any appeal or the expiration of the time to file an appeal:
 - i. permanently in cases in which a student is found responsible and is ultimately suspended or expelled;
 - ii. for five years in cases in which a student accepts responsibility or is found responsible, is not ultimately suspended or expelled, and is issued any Non-Academic Sanction other than a Letter of Warning;
 - iii. for two years in cases in which the student is issued a Letter of Warning;
 - iv. for one year in cases in which the student is found not responsible.

B. Honor Code Bodies

- 1. Campus Ethics Committee
 - a. Composition: The Campus Ethics Committee is composed of an undergraduate student from each college/school (selected by that college/school), a University of Colorado Student

Government representative, a United Government of Graduate Students representative, a faculty representative from the Boulder Faculty Assembly, the Academic Ethics Chairs from each college/school, and the Honor Code Council Advisor. Members of the Honor Code Council shall sit on the committee as ex-officio members. The Chair of the Honor Code Council shall sit as the Chair of the Campus Ethics Committee.

- b. Duties: The Campus Ethics Committee shall provide input, recommendations, and ideas pertaining to the Honor Code, advise faculty as to academic integrity, and promote the discussion of honor and integrity at the University of Colorado Boulder.
 - i. The Campus Ethics Committee will meet at least once during each of the fall and spring semesters.

2. Honor Code Council

- a. Composition: The Honor Code Council is composed of five students appointed according to Section B.2.d below. The Honor Code Council shall have a Chairperson, a Director of Adjudication, a Director of Investigations, a Director of Student Relations, and a Director of Faculty Relations, as well as a Faculty Advisor and the Honor Code Council Advisor.
 - i. Chairperson: The student who sits as the primary representative for the Honor Code Council and is responsible for its maintenance. The Chairperson will serve as the facilitator of the appeals process and cast a tie-breaking vote when necessary, as provided in Section B.3.a. The Chairperson will also be responsible for determining implementation of the case Dismissal and Withdrawal policy outlined in C.15.
 - ii. Director of Adjudication: The Director of Adjudication will oversee the hearing process and will coordinate with the Director of Investigations to ensure proper investigations are conducted. The Director of Adjudication is also responsible for composing a report to the Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs at the end of each academic year detailing the number of alleged offenses, number of violations, type of violations, and sanctions given. The Director of Adjudication is responsible for reporting key information about the hearing process, such as the operation and efficiency of hearings and the composition of the Hearing Panel Pool to the Campus Ethics Committee and Honor Code Council at least once a semester.
 - iii. Director of Investigations: The student responsible for investigating alleged violations of the Honor Code for students who deny responsibility. After an investigation is complete the Director of Investigations will provide the information, in the form of a neutral investigation report, to the Director of Adjudication and hearing panel so that the case may proceed.
 - iv. Director of Student Relations: The student responsible for developing and implementing materials regarding the Honor Code for all students. The Director of Student Relations is charged with training the Hearing Panel members and will also be responsible for the maintenance of all files regarding Hearing Panels. The Director of Student Relations will strive to ensure that students are well-informed about the purposes and operation of the Honor Code, including through information sessions and outreach activities. The Director of Student Relations will serve as a procedural advisor to accused students.
 - v. Director of Faculty Relations: The student responsible for distributing materials regarding the Honor Code to faculty, as well as maintaining open lines of communication between the Honor Code Council and faculty. The Director of Faculty Relations will ensure that faculty and staff at the University of Colorado Boulder are well informed as to the purpose, developments, and processes of the Honor Code.

- vi. Honor Code Council Administrative Advisor: The Honor Code Council Administrative Advisor is the Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs, or the Administrative Advisor's designee. The Administrative Advisor will advise the Honor Code Council as to general concerns pertaining to the Honor Code and will provide institutional memory for the Honor Code Council.
 - vii. Faculty Advisor: The Honor Code Council shall select a Faculty Advisor through an open application process. The Faculty Advisor is responsible for advising the Honor Code Council on issues related to faculty concerns. The Faculty Advisor will also be available to faculty regarding any Honor Code concerns.
- b. Duties: The Honor Code Council shall maintain and directly administer all Honor Code operations including, but not limited to, the procedures for case resolution. See Section C.
 - c. Terms of Office: The term of office for student Honor Code Council positions is one year with no term limits; however the Campus Ethics Committee may only reappoint Honor Code Council members upon review and approval at the final CEC meeting of the academic year. The term of office of the Faculty Advisor is two years, and the Honor Code Council Administrative Advisor serves for an indefinite period.
 - d. Appointment: Students interested in a position on the Honor Code Council must submit an application to the Honor Code Office. The Honor Code Council will review applications, conduct interviews, and select a worthy candidate. There will be a 90-day interim period wherein the candidate conducts business as a member of the Honor Code Council. If the selected student performs satisfactorily during the 90-day interim period, the Honor Code Council shall recommend the candidate to the Campus Ethics Committee for final approval by majority vote. If the selected candidate does not perform satisfactorily during the 90-day interim period, as determined by majority vote of the Honor Code Council, then the Chairperson will notify the selected candidate that the candidate's employment is terminated.
 - e. Removal of Members: Members of the Honor Code Council will be automatically removed if found in violation of the Honor Code or if found to have breached the confidentiality expectations of the Honor Code. Members of the Honor Code Council may be removed if they are placed on academic or disciplinary probation by the University, or if found in violation of the Student Code of Conduct. A member of the Honor Code Council can also be removed if the other members of the Honor Code Council recommend such to the Administrative and Faculty Advisors and if the advisors decide unanimously that it is appropriate to remove a member based on abuse of office, dereliction of duty, or unsatisfactory performance. In the event of disagreement between the two advisors, the Campus Ethics Committee shall break the tie by majority vote.
3. Hearing Panel Pool:
- a. Composition: The Hearing Panel Pool is the body from which members of the Hearing Panel are selected. Efforts will be made to ensure diversity of the Hearing Panel Pool; students will be selected from each college/school, as well as from different student organizations. All students are encouraged to apply. The Director of Adjudication will be responsible for determining the number of Hearing Panelists in the Hearing Panel Pool.
 - b. Application Process: Interested students can obtain an application from the Honor Code website or from the Honor Code Office. The Director of Student Relations or the Director of Student Relations' designee may interview applicants, and shall select members from among the applicants.

- c. Removal of Members: The Director of Adjudication may remove members of the Hearing Panel Pool if: i. they are placed on academic or disciplinary probation by the University; ii. they are found in violation of the Student Code of Conduct or the Honor Code; or iii. the Director of Adjudication determines they have neglected their duties or preformed unsatisfactorily.
4. Hearing Panel:
- a. Composition: The Hearing Panel is composed of no more than four voting student panel members, selected from the Hearing Panel Pool based on schedule availability, plus the Director of Adjudication or the Director of Adjudication's designee, who may only be another Councilmember. Quorum for the Hearing Panels shall be three voting student panel members and the Director of Adjudication or the Director of Adjudication's designee. The Hearing Panel will be trained by the Director of Student Relations or the Director of Student Relations' designee. Student representation on the Hearing Panel is required from both the accused student's college/school, and the college/school where the alleged violation occurred. If the accused student is a graduate student, at least two graduate student representatives must be on the panel. The Director of Adjudication or the Director of Adjudication's designee will chair the Hearing Panel and will vote only in the case of a tie.
 - i. If quorum for a hearing panel is not met, the accused student may proceed with the hearing by voluntarily waiving their right to appeal based on lack of quorum.
 - ii. If a waiver is signed, a member of the Honor Code Council may sit on the panel to serve only as a Hearing Panelist.
 - b. Duties: The Hearing Panel shall determine the culpability of students who have denied responsibility for an alleged Honor Code violation, and shall determine any appropriate Non-Academic Sanctions, if the student is found responsible. The Hearing Panel shall also conduct Non-Academic Sanction Reviews.
5. Appeals Board:
- a. Composition: The Appeals Board is composed of the Honor Code Council Chair, as the facilitator and vote tie-breaker, the Academic Ethics Chair of the accused student's school/college (or other faculty member designated by the dean's office from that college/school), the student on the Campus Ethics Committee from the accused student's school/college (or other student designated by the dean's office from that college/school), the University of Colorado Student Union representative to the Campus Ethics Committee (the United Government of Graduate Students representative if the alleged is a graduate student), and the Associate/Assistant Dean from the student's primary school/college (or another individual designated by the Dean in the event that the Associate/Assistant Dean is also the Ethics Chair).
 - b. Duties: The Appeals Board shall take one of the following actions: allow the decision of the Hearing Panel to stand; remand the case to a Hearing Panel chosen pursuant to Section B.3.a.; reverse the original Hearing Panel's verdict; or modify the sanction.

C. Procedures for Case Resolution

- 1. Time Period for Referral of Suspected Violations
 - a. The Honor Code office shall only accept reports of suspected Honor Code violations made within 42 calendar days from the date of discovery of the suspected violation. The Hearing Panel may consider allegations that were suspected more than 42 days before referral, where those allegations relate to more recent conduct which occurred within the 42-day time period.
- 2. Honor Code Report Forms

- a. Submission of Forms: All referral forms may be obtained in the Honor Code office or from the Honor Code website. Forms may be turned in to the Honor Code office via hand-delivery, e-mail, fax, or campus mail.
 - b. Faculty Referral Forms: Faculty Referral Forms are to be completed when a student is either suspected of violating the Honor Code or has admitted to violating it. This form should include all allegations and information pertinent to the alleged violation.
 - c. Student Referral Forms: Student Referral Forms are to be completed when a student suspects that another student has committed an Honor Code violation. This form should include all allegations and information pertinent to the alleged violation.
3. Reporting of Violations and Accusations
- c. Student Procedures
 - i. Students are expected to submit a Student Referral Form to both the Honor Code Office and the course instructor when they have direct knowledge of an Honor Code violation.
 - d. Faculty Procedures
 - i. Faculty members are expected to notify students regarding suspected Honor Code violations.
 - ii. Faculty members are expected to submit a Faculty Referral Form to the Honor Code Office. See Section C. 2.
 - iii. A faculty member with direct knowledge of an alleged Honor Code violation is expected to appear and provide information to a Hearing Panel in the event of a hearing.
4. Initial Contact
- a. Upon receipt of a Faculty or Student Referral Form, the Honor Code Council will notify the accused student of the allegations against the student.
 - i. The accused student or the reporting faculty member may, at any time, review the contents of the Honor Code file.
 - b. The accused student shall be assigned a procedural advisor who shall be The Director of Student Relations or the Director of Student Relations' designee. This advisor shall serve only to provide information regarding Honor Code policies and procedures.
 - c. The accused student must sign a Case Resolution Preference Form, stating the student's intent to either accept or deny responsibility for committing an Honor Code violation.
5. Signing of the Case Resolution Preference Form
- a. Acceptance of Responsibility: Generally, if the accused student accepts responsibility for committing an Honor Code violation, and has no previous violation, then the Director of Adjudication shall assign appropriate Non-Academic Sanctions. In such cases, the accused student may elect to meet with the Director of Adjudication to discuss any mitigating circumstances prior to the assignment of Non-Academic Sanctions. If an accused student who accepts responsibility has a previous violation, or if the violation is particularly egregious, the Director of Adjudication may convene a Hearing Panel to determine Non-Academic Sanctions.

- b. Denial of Responsibility: If the accused student denies responsibility for an Honor Code violation, the accusation shall be considered disputed. When an accusation is disputed, the case will proceed to an investigation and a hearing, as provided in Section C.6.
- c. Failure to Sign a Case Resolution Preference Form: If the accused student fails to sign a Case Resolution Preference Form within 10 business days of receiving notice of the allegations, excluding days the Honor Code Office is closed, the Director of Adjudication shall decide the outcome of the case in the accused student's absence. The Director of Adjudication may extend the 10-day response time where extraordinary circumstances arise which the student could not have anticipated (e.g., medical emergency, death of an immediate family member, etc.).

6. Investigation of Disputed Accusations

- a. The Director of Investigations will conduct an investigation for each disputed accusation. . The Director of Investigations shall contact the accused student and the faculty member(s), and any witnesses the Director of Investigations deems pertinent. The accused student shall have ten business days, excluding days the Honor Code Office is closed, to have a conversation with the Director of Investigations. If the accused student does not timely respond to the request from the Director of Investigations, the investigation shall proceed without the student's involvement, and the Director of Adjudication or the Director of Adjudication's designee may decide the outcome of the case in the student's absence. The Director of Adjudication may extend the 10-day response time where extraordinary circumstances arise which the individual could not have anticipated (e.g., medical emergency, death of an immediate family member).
- b. Upon completion of this investigation, and no later than 14 business days after receiving the accused student's response (excluding days the Honor Code Office is closed), the Director of Investigations will compile an investigation report to be included in the accused student's Honor Code file. The investigation report shall include supporting documents pertaining to the case; statements by the accused student, the faculty member, and any witnesses; and responses by either the student or faculty member to other parties' statement(s).
 - i. The Director of Investigations will provide the accused student and the faculty member(s) an opportunity to inspect and review the investigation report, and will provide any other witnesses an opportunity to review their own statements. If the accused student, faculty member(s), or witness(es) wish to correct or change any information in the statement that they provided to the Director of Investigations, they must do so within three business days, excluding days the Honor Code Office is closed, after which period the Honor Code Office shall proceed with scheduling a hearing. Unless extenuating circumstances arise, the Director of Investigations will not extend the deadline for parties and witnesses to amend their statements.
- c. Upon completion of the investigation process, the case will proceed to the hearing process.

7. Notice of Hearing

- a. The accused student and reporting faculty member will be notified of the hearing date and time at least five business days prior to the hearing.
 - i. If the accused student or reporting faculty member wishes to attend the hearing but is unable to do so on the set date, the student or faculty member may ask that the hearing be rescheduled. The hearing will be rescheduled as long as this request is received no later than two business days, excluding days the Honor Code Office is closed, prior to the time of the scheduled hearing. The Honor Code Council will not grant either party's request to reschedule the hearing made within two business days, excluding days the Honor Code Office is closed, of its scheduled time, absent extenuating circumstances (e.g., death of a close relative, urgent medical situation, etc.).

- b. The Honor Code Council will notify the accused student and the reporting faculty member of the names of the Hearing Panelists at least five business days prior to the hearing.
 - i. Members of the Hearing Panel or Appeals Board who have a professional or social relationship with the accused student or reporting faculty member must remove themselves from the Hearing Panel or Appeals Board when necessary to avoid any possibility of impropriety or bias.
 - ii. The accused student or reporting faculty member may challenge the presence of any member of the Hearing Panel based on a pre-existing relationship that the student or faculty member believes may interfere with the impartiality of the process. Challenges must be submitted to the Honor Code Council at least three business days, excluding days the Honor Code Office is closed, prior to the hearing.
 - iii. Upon the recusal of a member, the Honor Code Council will appoint an appropriate substitute from the Hearing Panel Pool.

8. Advisors and Witnesses

- a. The accused student may bring an advisor of the student's choosing. However, advisors are not permitted to speak for or on behalf of the student during any phase of the Honor Code process, including the hearing. The accused student must inform the Honor Code Office of the student's intent to bring an advisor at least two business days, excluding days the Honor Code Office is closed, prior to the hearing.
 - i. If the accused student intends to bring an attorney as an advisor, the student must notify the Honor Code Council at least three business days, excluding days the Honor Code Office is closed, prior to the hearing. In this case, an attorney from the Office of University Counsel may also be present at the hearing.
- b. The accused student and reporting faculty member may call a limited number of witnesses. Each witness must provide information which is neither redundant nor irrelevant to the case, as decided by the Director of Adjudication or Director of Adjudication's designee. The number of witnesses acceptable at each hearing is at the discretion of the Director of Adjudication or Director of Adjudication's designee and will be decided on a case-by-case basis. The accused student and/or reporting faculty member must inform the Honor Code Office of the names of any witnesses two business days, excluding days the Honor Code Office is closed, prior to the hearing.
- c. The accused student and/or reporting faculty member may bring a translator of their choosing, excluding translators that are also serving as an advisor, a lawyer, or a witness for the student or faculty member involved. The translator must only translate and may not present any evidence for the student or faculty member. The accused student or reporting faculty member must inform the Honor Code Office of their intent to bring a translator at least two business days, excluding days the Honor Code Office is closed, prior to the hearing.

9. Hearing Process

- a. General
 - i. All hearings will be confidential and closed to the public.
 - ii. All hearings will be audio recorded for internal use only. The recordings will be kept according to the Council's normal recordkeeping policy (see Section A.9.c.)
- b. Hearing Procedure
 - i. The Director of Adjudication or the Director of Adjudication's designee will call the hearing to order and note the date and accused student's name for the audio

recording. The Director of Adjudication will then remind all present that the hearing is strictly confidential.

- a. If quorum for a hearing panel is not met, the accused student may proceed with the hearing by voluntarily waiving the right to appeal based on lack of quorum.
 - ii. The Director of Adjudication or the Director of Adjudication's designee will provide a brief overview of the charges.
 - iii. The accused student will be given the opportunity to make an opening statement in response to the allegations
 - iv. The witness' and reporting faculty member's account and information will be presented.
 - v. The Director of Adjudication and the Hearing Panel may ask questions of the accused student and any faculty or witnesses present.
 - vi. The accusing party may make a closing statement
 - vii. The accused student may make a closing statement.
 - viii. After all parties leave, the Hearing Panel will make a decision.
- c. If the student does not attend the scheduled hearing, the hearing will proceed in the student's absence and responsibility will be determined with the evidence available. In extraordinary circumstances, as determined by the Director of Adjudication, a new hearing may be called if the student's absence was due to extraordinary circumstances which the student could not have anticipated and about which the student could not have provided advance notice to the Hearing Panel (e.g., medical emergency, death of immediate family member, etc.).

10. Information Standard in Hearing Process

- a. The Hearing Panel shall reach its determination by majority vote based on a preponderance of the evidence presented at the hearing or gathered during the investigation process. The preponderance of the evidence standard of proof requires information sufficient to demonstrate that it is more likely than not that the alleged violation occurred. The Hearing Panel shall not apply technical rules of evidence, and may consider any information it seems relevant.

11. Finding of Responsibility through Hearing Process

- a. If the accused student is found not responsible of an Honor Code violation by the Hearing Panel, the allegations will be dismissed and the record shall be expunged according to the record-keeping provisions in Section A.9.
- b. If the accused student is found responsible of an Honor Code violation by the Hearing Panel, the case shall be subject to non-academic sanctioning by the Hearing Panel.

12. Sanctioning

- a. The course instructor alone retains the authority to determine appropriate Academic Sanctions i.e. grades.
- b. The Hearing Panel shall determine appropriate Non-Academic Sanctions in cases of disputed accusations where the accused student was found responsible for having committed a violation of the Honor Code. The Hearing Panel shall also determine appropriate Non-Academic Sanctions when the Director of Adjudication has convened a Hearing Panel as provided in Section C.4.a. Any such sanctions must be approved by a majority vote of the Hearing Panel.

In determining Non-Academic Sanctions, the Hearing Panel shall consider egregiousness of the offense, mitigating and aggravating circumstances, and the student's prior record.

- c. Expulsion or suspension may not be issued directly by the Director of Adjudication, Hearing Panel, or Appeals Board. The Director of Adjudication, Director of Adjudication's designee, Hearing Panel, or Appeals Board may recommend expulsion or suspension as an appropriate Non-Academic Sanction to the Dean of Students.
- d. Students found responsible for violating the Honor Code will be assessed an adjudication fee of \$50.00 per case.

13. Notification of Decision

- a. Upon the conclusion of Honor Code case resolution process, the Director of Adjudication shall send written notice of the decision to the accused student that shall detail the findings of the Hearing Panel and any Non-Academic Sanctions assigned.
- b. Notice of the decision, and of any Non-Academic Sanctions assigned, shall be distributed by the Honor Code Council to parties with a legitimate educational interest including, but not limited to:
 - i. The accused student
 - ii. The Associate/Assistant Dean of the college of the accused student's primary college/school
 - iii. The reporting faculty member

14. Appeals

- a. Either the accused student or the reporting faculty member may appeal the Hearing Panel's decision regarding responsibility. Appeals must be submitted to the Honor Code Council in writing within 10 business days, excluding days the Honor Code Office is closed, of the date of the decision letter.
- b. An appeal must be based either on: i. procedural deficiencies in the established hearing process; or ii. the emergence of substantive new information which was not available at the time of the hearing.
- c. Appeal forms may be obtained on the Honor Code website or at the Honor Code Office.
- d. If a student or faculty member submits an appeal form in accordance with time limits herein, the Chair shall determine whether one or both of the grounds for an appeal outlined in Section C.13.b. are applicable. If either ground applies, the Chair shall convene the Appeals Board to review the case. The Appeals Board shall not hear testimony from the accused student, the accusing faculty member, or any witnesses. Review of the case shall be on the record of the case alone unless the basis of the appeal is new information not available at the time of the hearing. All new information to be considered within the case record must be submitted with the appeal form.
- e. The Appeals Board shall decide appeals, and shall issue a decision authorized in Section B.5.b, by majority vote.

15. Non-Academic Sanction Reviews

- a. A Non-Academic Sanction Review shall commence if the Director of Adjudication determines that a student has not complied with the Non-Academic Sanctions assigned by the Director of Adjudication, Hearing Panel, or Appeals Board.

- b. The Non-Academic Sanction Review may result in increased Non-Academic Sanctions, including, but not limited to, a hold being placed on the accused student's educational records or referral for consideration of suspension or expulsion (see Section C.11.c).

16. Dismissal or Withdrawal of Honor Code Cases.

- a. A pending Honor Code case may be dismissed if the Office of Institutional Equity and Compliance (OIEC) finds discrimination or harassment was a motivating factor for the accusing party to refer the alleged violation to the Honor Code Office. The Honor Code Council will rely on the outcome of the OIEC's investigation to determine whether the case should be dismissed.
- b. A pending Honor Code case may be withdrawn at the request of the accusing party if that party determines that the accusation was unfounded. Such requests may only be granted by review and majority vote of the Honor Code Council.
- c. The Honor Code Council may defer consideration of a pending Honor Code case if the Honor Code Council determines by majority vote that another campus disciplinary or investigative process is more appropriately suited to the charges. If the Honor Code Council defers consideration of a case while another campus disciplinary or investigative process proceeds, then at the conclusion of such other process, the Honor Code Council shall determine by majority vote whether to re-open its investigation or close the case based on the outcome of such other process.

D. Revisions of the Honor Code Policies and Procedures

- 1. Revisions must be first approved by a two-thirds vote of the Campus Ethics Committee. After this approval, both the University of Colorado Boulder Student Government Legislative Council and the Boulder Faculty Assembly Executive Committee must approve the revisions by a majority vote of the members present at the meeting.
- 2. As outlined in Section A.7.c., Academic Sanctions remain within the purview of faculty. Any revision that proposes to reallocate authority over Academic Sanctions must be approved by a majority vote of the deans and faculty of each college/school, in addition to the procedures designated in D.1.

*Updated: May, 2015

Campus Ethics Committee Approval: 05/27/2015

University of Colorado Student Government Approval: 06/18/2015

Boulder Faculty Assembly Approval: 10/19/2015