Procedures of the Undergraduate Academic Honor Code

I. The Undergraduate Academic Honor Code

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

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

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

II. Membership in the Honor Council and Appeal Panel

A. Composition of the Honor Council and Appeal Panel

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

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

B. Selection of the Honor Council and Appeal Panel

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

C. Honor Council and Appeal Panel Membership Enrollment Qualifications

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

D. Chair

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

E. Removal of Members

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

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

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

III. Reporting Cases

A. Duty to Report

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

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

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

Upon preliminary review, the dean may dismiss an allegation of academic misconduct without referring it for further investigation for one of three reasons:
• The conduct does not appear to constitute academic misconduct.
• There is insufficient evidence to pursue an investigation.
• The dean deems the suspected offense trivial in nature.

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

IV. Procedural Overview and Resolution Options

A. Overview

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

1. Informal Resolution

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

2. Investigation and Full Hearing

The Honor Council uses an investigation and full hearing process to gather the facts of a case and determine whether a student is responsible for an alleged violation of the Honor Code. This process is the standard way for resolving a report of a violation, unless the student chooses to go through informal resolution, or the case meets the special circumstances required for an administrative hearing.

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

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

V. Procedures and Process - All Resolution Options

A. Notice of Charge(s)

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

B. Advisors to Reported Students

1. Permitted Advisors

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

Advisors must be one of the following: a current undergraduate student at Emory University; a current faculty or staff member in Emory College of Arts and Sciences, Goizueta Business School, the Nell Hodgson Woodruff School of Nursing, or Oxford College; or a current staff member in Campus Life. No student, faculty, or staff member will be required to serve as a student’s advisor.

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

2. Advisor Role

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

C. Attending Meetings of the Honor Council

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

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

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

D. Evidence

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

E. Witnesses

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

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

F. Honor Council Proceedings

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

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

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

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

H. Summary Report, Decision, and Notification of Outcome

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

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

VI. Procedures and Process – Specific to Resolution Route

A. Informal Resolution Meetings

1. Circumstances for Offering an Informal Resolution Meeting

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

At any point prior to making a final decision, the Honor Council may refer the reported student to the investigation and full hearing process if it becomes necessary to conduct an investigation or if the Honor Council finds that the student is not being fully honest and transparent in their admission of responsibility.
If a case involves multiple students, and any of the reported students do not wish to pursue an informal resolution meeting, the case will normally be referred to the investigation and full hearing process, unless the nature of the case allows the Honor Council to adjudicate each student’s report separately.

2. Procedures

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

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

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

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

B. Investigation and Full Hearing Process

1. Investigation

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

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

2. Referral

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

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

3. Full Hearing Notification

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

4. Full Hearing Board

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

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

5. Procedures for Full Hearings

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

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

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

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

C. Administrative Hearing Process

1. Circumstances for Offering an Administrative Hearing

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

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

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

2. Administrative Hearing Board

The Administrative Hearing Board will consist of three members:

(1) an undergraduate student Honor Council member;

(2) a faculty Honor Council member or an Honor Code administrator;

(3) a the third member who may be a student Honor Council member, a faculty Honor Council member, or an Honor Code administrator.
The Honor Code administrator will serve as chair of the Administrative Hearing Board for hearings that they attend, or will designate one of the Administrative Hearing Board members to serve as chair for hearings that they do not attend.

3. Procedures for Administrative Hearings

At an administrative hearing, the chair will call the hearing to order and inform the reported student of their rights. The reporting faculty member and any witnesses will separately make a statement about the alleged violation and respond to any questions from the hearing board while the reported student is present. The reported student will then make a statement and respond to any questions from the hearing board privately; the reporting faculty member, witnesses, and other reported students are not permitted to listen to this testimony. The Honor Council may recall any party for additional questions, and the reported student will then have the right to make a closing statement. At the discretion of the Administrative Hearing Board, any party to the case who is unable to participate in the hearing may provide a written statement that will be reviewed by the Administrative Hearing Board.

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

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

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

VII. Appeals - Procedures and Process

A. Rights and Grounds for Appeals

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

Students must submit their appeal to the dean within ten business days of receiving the dean’s written decision. The only grounds for submitting an appeal are as follows:
(a) The Honor Council did not administer the procedures according to its published policies, and it is likely these errors could have substantially altered the decision of the Honor Council.

(b) The sanctions were disproportionate to the circumstances of the violation.

(c) There is new evidence, which could not have been reasonably discovered prior to the hearing, and it likely would have substantially altered the decision of the Honor Council.

B. Appeal Panel and Process

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

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

(a) deny the appeal and affirm the finding of responsibility and sanctions;

(b) affirm the finding of responsibility but modify the sanctions in any way the panel deems fit; or,

(c) remand the case to the Honor Council for a new hearing according to the procedures for a rehearing.

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

C. Procedures for a Rehearing

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

VIII. Special Provisions

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

B. Cases Involving Multiple Students

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

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

C. Cases Involving Multiple Charges Against the Same Student

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

D. Introducing Additional Charges during Honor Code Investigations and Hearings

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

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

E. Course Enrollment and Grading Basis

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

F. Sanctions Involving Students Who Have Cross-Registered
If a student is found responsible for an Honor Code violation in a course where they have cross-registered in a different school, the Honor Council may recommend appropriate sanctions. If the sanction involves suspension, dismissal from the program, permanent expulsion from Emory University, or revocation of an Emory University degree that has been previously awarded, the recommendation will be forwarded to the dean of the school in which the student is primarily enrolled. The dean of the school in which the student is primarily enrolled will make a decision about the sanction of the case. This provision applies to decisions of the Honor Council and of the Appeal Board.

G. Modifications to Procedures

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

H. Faculty Compliance

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

IX. Miscellaneous

A. Confidentiality

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

B. Dean and Designees

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

C. Chair and Designees

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

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

E. Amendments to the Procedures

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