

Honor Code

Preamble

We, the members of the student body of Luther College, believe that one of the basic functions of an institution dedicated to the Christian faith and engaged in higher education is the development of academic integrity and responsibility.

We therefore hereby resolve to uphold individually and collectively the honor of the college by doing all that is within our power to prevent any form of dishonesty in our academic work and our college life.

We manifest our conviction in this Honor Code for all students at Luther College. The Honor Code does not assure honest behavior; rather, it provides for the sharing of responsibility for enforcing honorable conduct between the instructor and the student; the student remains responsible for ensuring the integrity of their own behavior and for reporting to the instructor or other appropriate authorities any violation of the Honor Code of which they may be aware.

We also recognize that the honor of the individual person should be the concern of any Christian community and that the Honor Code is an attempt to put into practice those values or principles of conduct which are consistent with such a community. As we are part of this community by our own free will, we feel that it is our duty to hold ourselves to this high standard of integrity and responsibility.

Terms and Definitions

1.1 The Luther College Honor Code **applies** to all students, all classes, and all academic work at Luther, as well as to all academic work for which students request academic credit from Luther.

1.2 A **Violation of the Honor Code** can be any action or inaction of a student or a group of students which might create an unfair or undeserved academic advantage, which is intended to deceive students or faculty, or which a reasonable person would consider dishonest academic behavior.

1.2.1 Also considered violations of the Honor Code are all actions that interfere with the work of the Honor Council, including, but not limited to the destruction of evidence, the intimidation of witnesses or complainants, or retaliatory actions against witnesses or complainants.

1.2.2 Faculty can report suspected violations of academic integrity to the Honor Council or they may elect to handle the suspected violation according to Faculty Handbook policy. Should a faculty member choose not to utilize the Honor Council, they shall file a summary of the violation and the outcome to both the Provost's Office and the Student Life Dean's Office. If the faculty member elects to handle a suspected violation according to the Faculty Handbook policy, the student retains the right to an appeal using the Campus Appeals Board (see section 7.0 for information on appeals).

1.2.3 Students can report suspected violations of academic integrity to the Honor Council or the instructor of the course.

1.3 **Forms of Honor Code violation** are, but are not limited to:

1.3.1 **Cheating.** Intentionally using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise. The term includes, but is not limited to:

1.3.1.1 Use of any unauthorized assistance in taking quizzes, tests, or examinations.

1.3.1.2 Use of sources beyond those authorized by the instructor in writing papers, preparing reports, solving problems, or carrying out other assignments.

1.3.1.3 The acquisition, without permission, of tests or other academic material belonging to a member of the Luther College faculty or staff.

1.3.1.4 Engaging in any behavior specifically prohibited by a faculty member in the course syllabus or class discussion.

1.3.2 **Fabrication.** Intentional and unauthorized falsification or invention of any information or citation in an academic exercise.

1.3.3 **Facilitating academic dishonesty.** Knowingly helping or attempting to help another to violate any provision of this Honor Code.

1.3.4 **Plagiarism.** Using or representing the words or ideas of another as one's own in any academic exercise. The term includes, but is not limited to, the use, by paraphrase or direct quotation, of the published or unpublished work of another person without full and clear acknowledgment. It also includes the unacknowledged use of materials prepared by another person or agency engaged in the selling of term papers or other academic materials.

1.3.4.1 **Artificial Intelligence (A.I.).** Presenting words generated from an artificial intelligence like ChatGPT or Grammarly as your own words in any work, or using AI when prohibited in a course or assignment. This does not include the use of grammar and spell check included in Google Docs and Microsoft Word.

1.4 The term “**Complainant**” means any person who submits a charge alleging that a student violated this Honor Code. When a student believes that they have been a victim of another student’s misconduct, the student who believes they have been a victim will have the same rights under this Honor Code as are provided to the Complainant, even if another member of the Luther College community submitted the charge itself.

1.5 The term “**Respondent**” means any student accused of violating this Honor Code.

1.6 The following groups and officers are responsible for the promotion and enforcement of this Honor Code:

1.6.1 The **Honor Council** is the student body that promotes the Honor Code at Luther College.

1.6.2 The **Honor Council Chair** (HCC) is the elected chair of the Honor Council.

1.6.3 The **Honor Council Vice Chair** (HCVC) is the elected to assist the HCC.

1.7 The **Faculty Advisor to the Honor Council** is the appointed non-voting faculty representative for the Honor Council.

1.8 The **Campus Appeals Board** hears any appeals for decisions of the Honor Council.

1.9 All definitions in the **Code of Conduct** apply to the Honor Code as they relate to it.

The Honor Council

2.1 The **Honor Council** is elected by the students of Luther College.

2.1.1 The Honor Council shall ideally be made up of ten students, with at least two students from each the sophomore, junior and Senior Class.

2.1.2 The First-year Class, the Sophomore Class, and the Junior Class shall each elect members to the Council (as needed) at their respective class elections held during the spring semester, to take office the following fall.

2.1.3 Members, once elected, shall continue in office until their graduation, until they leave college, choose to resign their position or are otherwise removed.

2.1.4 The Honor Council is functional as long as there can be a quorum for the Honor Council. The Honor Council Chair can request the Student Senate to appoint members from the student body to the Honor Council until the vacant positions can be filled by a regular election.

2.1.5 The Faculty Advisor is a non-voting member of the Honor Council.

2.2 The **Officers of the Honor Council** are the Honor Council Chair and the Honor Council Vice Chair.

2.2.1 The Honor Council Chair is elected by and from the Honor Council for one year with no term limit.

2.2.2 The Honor Council Vice Chair is elected by and from the Honor Council for one year with no term limit.

2.2.3 Both positions will be filled by elections by and from the Honor Council at the beginning of each spring semester and immediately as they become vacant.

2.3 The Honor Council is charged to conduct Honor Code Reviews of cases of alleged violations of the Honor Code.

2.3.1 The Honor Council Chair or Honor Council Vice Chair must be present and lead the discussion of each meeting.

2.3.2 The quorum for any Honor Code Review is five student members including the Chair or Vice Chair and the Faculty Advisor.

2.3.3 The faculty advisor is a non-voting member of the Honor Council and must be present at all Honor Code Reviews.

2.4 Any member of the Honor Council who is found incompetent or otherwise objectionable may be removed from the membership of the Honor Council by a majority vote of the Council. Action may be instituted against such a member by a majority vote of the Honor Council or by petition signed by twenty members of the Student Body. All voting shall be by ballot.

Responsibilities

3.1 The responsibilities of the **Honor Council** are:

3.1.1 To promote the Honor Code across campus.

3.1.2 To create and conduct educational programming designed to promote academic integrity especially in the first year orientation and the Paideia program.

3.1.3 To advise and consult with faculty members and administrative officers on matters pertaining to academic integrity.

3.1.4 To issue an annual report to the Student Senate, the Campus Life Committee, and the Provost of the College on academic integrity standards, policies, and procedures, including recommendations for appropriate changes.

3.1.5 To review the Honor Code for the Student Senate.

3.1.6 To create necessary bylaws for the Honor Council.

3.1.7 To investigate alleged Honor Code violations.

3.1.8 To issue sanctions for Honor Code violations.

3.1.9 To provide written statements for the Campus Appeals Board during the appeals process.

3.2 The responsibilities of the **Honor Council Chair** are:

3.2.1 To organize and lead meetings of the Honor Council.

3.2.2 To appoint two recorders for each Honor Code Review.

3.2.3 To communicate with all parties during an Honor Council investigation.

3.2.4 To oversee work of the Honor Council.

3.2.5 To report to the Student Senate about the work of the Honor Council, possible vacancies, and the review process at least once a standard semester.

3.3 The responsibilities of the **Honor Council Vice Chair** are:

3.3.1 To keep the minutes of the Honor Council meetings.

3.3.2 To maintain the website of the Honor Council.

3.3.3 To supervise and assist the Honor Council where and when needed.

3.3.4 To lead Honor Code Review meetings when the HCC is not available.

3.3.5 To lead efforts to educate students about academic integrity and the Luther College Honor Code.

3.4 The **Honor Council Recordors** keep the records of each meeting of the Honor Council and create a protocol of the investigations and deliberations.

3.5 The **Faculty Advisor** takes part in the deliberations of the Honor Council but has no vote. The opinion of the Faculty Advisor is recorded if different from the Honor Council decision.

3.6 The responsibilities of the **Campus Appeals Board** (annotation 4) are:

3.6.1 To inform the Honor Council Chair about an appeal.

3.6.2 To consider the written statement of the Honor Council.

3.6.3 To inform the Honor Council Chair about the result of the appeals process.

Procedures of the Honor Council

4.1 All aspects of the Honor Code Reviews are confidential and cannot be shared with anyone outside the Honor Council except the student's academic advisor, Honor Council faculty advisor, and the provost's office, unless the investigation or the Honor Code requires it.

4.2 Any member of the Luther College community (student, faculty, or staff) may file charges against a student for violations of the Honor Code.

4.2.1 All charges shall be prepared in some form of written medium whenever possible and directed to the Honor Council Chair or any other member of the Honor Council.

4.2.2 Any charge should be submitted as soon as possible after the event takes place, preferably within ten class days.

4.2.2.1 If a charge is presented during the J-Term semester or the Summer semester, the case will be heard as soon as possible during the next standard semester.

4.2.2.2 The Honor Council may stop hearing cases two weeks prior to the week of finals and may postpone any pending cases to be heard during the next standard academic semester.

4.2.3 If a Complainant cannot or will not submit a written charge, the Honor Council Chair or any other member of the Honor Council will prepare a written summary of the charge presented to them by the Complainant.

4.2.4 A Complainant may choose to stay anonymous to the Respondent.

4.2.5 Once a charge has been filed with the Honor Council, it cannot be retracted and a full Honor Code Review has to be conducted.

4.2.6 The Complainant and Respondent of a pending case should not directly or via third parties discuss the charges. Intimidation of the Complainant or of Witnesses by the Respondent or third parties must be reported to the Honor Council immediately.

4.2.7 Any retaliatory actions against a Complainant or Witnesses by the Respondent or third parties should be reported to the Honor Council.

4.3 Once the Honor Council has been informed of a complaint, a Honor Council Review will be prepared by the Honor Council Chair.

4.3.1 If necessary, the HCC can request clarifications from the Complainant prior to the Honor Council Review.

4.3.2 The HCC will select the date, time and place for the Honor Council Review, and notify the Respondent in writing, a minimum of three (3) class days prior to the Honor Council Review.

4.3.3 The HCC may summon any student witness to the meeting who can help with the investigation. Witnesses have to appear before the Honor Council or have to submit a written statement. Not complying with a summoning can be sanctioned as a violation of the Honor Code.

4.3.4 The Respondent can choose not to appear in person but to submit a written statement.

4.3.5 If a Respondent, who has received notice as set forth in the Honor Code, does not attend the Honor Council Review and does not submit a written statement, the information in support of the charges shall be presented and considered even if the Respondent is not present.

4.3.6 If a Complainant decides not to participate in an Honor Council Review, the HCC may or may not elect to present the information in support of the charges.

4.4 For every meeting, the HCC first appoints the two recorders. The records of the Honor Council shall be filed by the HCC to the Provost's Office after a case decision has been made and sent to the involved parties.

4.5 A quorum is composed of five Honor Council student members (including a Chairperson) and the non-voting faculty Advisor.

4.6 The sequence of an Honor Code Review is necessarily controlled by the nature of the incident to be investigated and the character of the information to be examined. It thus lies within the judgment of the HCC to fashion the most reasonable approach.

4.6.1 All procedural questions are subject to the final decision of the Chairperson of the Honor Council.

4.6.2 Formal rules of process, procedure, and/or technical rules of evidence, such as are applied in criminal or civil court, are not used in Honor Code proceedings.

4.7 The Complainant, the Respondent and the Honor Council may arrange for witnesses to present pertinent information to the Council.

4.7.1 The HCC will request the attendance of possible witnesses who are members of the Luther College community, and who are identified by the Complainant and/or Respondent at least two class days prior to the Honor Council Review.

4.7.2 Witnesses will provide information to and answer questions from the Honor Council. Questions may be suggested by the Respondent and/or Complainant to be answered by each other or by other witnesses.

4.7.3 The Honor Council will consider the advisability of such suggested questions and will determine, in its sole discretion, whether such questions will be posed. If so, the Chairperson of the Council will direct the question to the witness. Questions of whether potential information will be received shall be resolved at the discretion of the Honor Council.

4.8 The Complainant and the Respondent have the right to be assisted by one advisor they choose, at their own expense.

4.8.1 The advisor serves in a support or advisory role and may not be or function as an attorney.

4.8.2 The Complainant and/or the Respondent will be responsible for presenting their own information, and therefore, the advisor is not permitted to speak or to participate directly in the Honor Code Review. The advisor cannot directly address the Honor Council.

4.8.3 A student should select a person whose schedule allows attendance at the scheduled date and time for the Honor Code Review because delays will not be allowed due to the scheduling conflicts of an advisor.

4.9 The Complainant, Respondent and their advisors, if any, shall be allowed to attend the entire portion of the hearing at which the Respondent is present (excluding deliberations). Admission of any other person to the hearing shall be at the discretion of the Honor Council.

4.9.1 If a Witness brought to the hearing by the Complainant is a part of the hearing, the Respondent is to be excluded from the hearing until the Witness has left.

4.10 If a member of the Honor Council or the Faculty Advisor are directly involved with a case brought to an Honor Code Review, either as Complainants or witnesses, it is recommended that they do not take part and do not vote in the deliberations. However, they do not have to recuse themselves as long as any of the remaining members do not object.

4.10.1 If the Faculty Advisor is also the Academic Advisor to a Respondent, they may recuse themselves from the hearing but must make arrangements for a substitute Faculty Advisor to take their place and communicate with the HCC or HCVC about the situation.

4.11 In the investigative part of the Honor Code Review, the following steps are typical:

4.11.1 The HCC informs the members of the Honor Council about the case and the known facts. How this is done is at the discretion of the HCC.

4.11.2 If present, the Respondent is informed of the complaint and may have access to all pertinent information.

4.11.3 If present, the Respondent shall be requested to make a statement if they so desire, or the written statement of the Respondent will be read.

4.11.4 The Respondent can present their witnesses. After these witnesses provide their statements, they will be questioned by the Honor Council.

4.11.5. The Respondent may request to question the Complainant or any witness through the HCC. The Respondent does not have the right to confront the Complainant or any witness directly or to know their identity.

4.11.6 During the hearing, Respondent, Complainant, and Witnesses can be questioned by all members of the Honor Council (including the non-voting Faculty Advisor) at any time before the deliberation.

4.11.7 The Honor Council Chair closes the investigation if there is a consensus that no further questioning is needed or might be helpful.

4.12 After the investigative portion of the Honor Code Review concludes in which all pertinent information has been received, the Honor Council shall determine by majority vote whether the Respondent has violated the Honor Code.

4.12.1 The Honor Council's determination shall be made on the basis of whether it is more likely than not that the Respondent violated the Honor Code.

4.12.2 All "hearsay" and "opinion" evidence shall be excluded from the final decision determined by the Honor Council.

4.12.2.1 Testimony from student witnesses will only be considered as evidence if the witnesses agree to allow the accused student to question them in writing.

4.12.2.2 If student witnesses do not agree to that condition, their testimony may be used by the Honor Council as a basis for initiating an investigation, but may not be used as evidence of responsibility.

4.12.3 Pertinent records, exhibits, and written statements may be accepted and considered as information for consideration by the Honor Council at the discretion of the Council.

4.12.4 If responsibility has been established, members shall recommend appropriate sanctions, which will be accepted by majority vote.

4.13 If a decision has been reached, the Honor Council Chair will inform the Complainant, the Respondent, Provost's Office, and Academic Advisor in writing within seven (7) days after the Honor Council Hearing.

Additional Responsibilities of the Honor Council

5.1 The Honor Council is encouraged to educate students about academic integrity, the Honor Code and the proper way to report Honor Code violations.

5.2 The Honor Council may design and coordinate educational opportunities throughout the academic year. Strategies may include but are not limited to working with academic advising sessions, Paideia I faculty, open forums, Orientation sessions and Residence Hall floor meetings. Additional suggestions would be posters, SPO letters, announcements, and news articles in Chips addressing the Honor Code procedures, etc.

5.3 One year prior to the three year review of the Honor Code the Honor Council will conduct an internal review of the Honor Code. (Reviewed last in 2025, spring semester)

5.3.1 The Honor Council shall elect three from among its committee to serve on the internal review. It will consist of one member from the Senior class, one member from the Junior class and one member from the Sophomore class. These three students shall lead the review and present the findings to the Honor Council, the Student Senate and the Campus Life Committee by the end of the academic year.

5.4 Every three years the Honor Council will work to inform and educate the Student Body prior to reaffirming or rejecting the Honor Code in a referendum held during regular student government elections. (see section 8.2)

Sanctions

6.1 If a respondent has been found responsible of an Honor Code violation, the Honor Council can impose one or more of the following sanctions:

6.1.1 Warning.

6.1.2 Recommendation that the student be allowed to do the work again.

6.1.3 Recommendation for no credit for the work in question.

6.1.4 Recommendation to lower the grade in the course.

6.1.5 Recommendation of suspension or dismissal.

6.1.6 Barring the student from participation in any campus-wide elections for a time.

6.1.7 Removing the student from any campus-wide elected office for a time.

6.1.8 Requiring the student to write a reflection on Academic Honesty, which will be reviewed by the Provost of the College or any other person the Provost determines.

6.1.8.1 The essay should be of appropriate length and is due ten days after the deadline for an appeal has expired or ten days after an appeal has been denied, whichever comes later.

6.1.8.2 After the essay has been accepted, the student shall meet with the Provost or any other person the Provost determines in order to discuss the essay.

6.1.8.3 If the essay is not submitted within the required time frame, the Honor Council can recommend further sanctions.

6.1.9 Requiring the student to take part in a workshop on Academic Honesty, conducted by the Honor Council. If the student misses two opportunities to successfully complete the workshop, the Honor Council can recommend further sanctions.

6.2 Sanctions can be imposed even if the Respondent at the time of the decision is no longer a student at Luther.

Appeals Process

7.1. A decision reached by the Honor Council may be appealed by the Respondent(s) or Complainant(s) to the Campus Appeals Board (See annotation 4) within 7 days of notification of the decision.

7.2. Except as required to explain the basis of new information, an appeal shall be limited to a review of the record of the Honor Council, or a written summary thereof, prepared by the Council, and supporting documents for one or more of the following purposes:

7.2.1 To determine whether the Honor Code Review was conducted fairly in light of the charges and information presented, and in conformity with prescribed procedures giving the Complainant a reasonable opportunity to prepare and to present information that the Honor Code was violated, and giving the Respondent a reasonable opportunity to prepare and to present a response to those allegations. Deviations from designated procedures will not be a basis for sustaining an appeal unless significant prejudice results.

7.2.2 To determine whether the decision reached regarding the Respondent was based on substantial information; that is, whether there were facts in the case that, if believed by the fact finder, were sufficient to establish that a violation of the Honor Code occurred.

7.2.3 To determine whether the sanction(s) imposed were appropriate for the violation of the Honor Code which the student was found to have committed.

7.2.4 To consider new information or other relevant facts not brought out in the original hearing, sufficient to alter a decision, because such information and/or facts were not known to the person appealing at the time of the original Honor Code Review.

7.3. If an appeal is upheld by the Campus Appeals Board, the matter shall be returned to the Honor Council for re-opening of the case to allow reconsideration of the original determination and/or sanction(s). If an appeal is not upheld, the matter shall be considered final and binding upon all involved.

7.4. If a student found responsible for violating the Honor Code finds new evidence bearing on his or her case, the Honor Council is obliged to hold a new hearing and may be directed to do so by the Campus Appeals Board.

7.5 A case shall not be reviewed by the Honor Council more than two times, unless a majority of the Council votes in favor of another review.

Annotation: The *Student Code of Conduct* states in article IV, section D:

"4. The Campus Appeals Board is comprised of three members including one faculty member, typically the Chair of the Faculty Interest Committee; one student, typically the President of the Luther College Student Senate; and the and Dean for Student Engagement. Depending upon the circumstances of the case, an alternative designee may review the case if it is determined a conflict of interest may arise based upon the specified representation."

To file an appeal with the Campus Appeals Board, send an email or a letter to the Dean for Student Engagement, **Julie Thornton** (julie.thornton@luther.edu).

If you have questions concerning the appeals process, you can also contact the Faculty Advisor to the Honor Council, **Susan Schmidt** (susan.schmidt@luther.edu).

Review, Amendment, and Revisions

8.1 All revisions and amendments to this constitution shall be presented in writing to the Luther College Student Senate and its president.

8.1.1 Proposed amendments shall be posted and published in *Chips* in electronic format for two weeks prior to the first reading before the members of the Campus Life Committee session and/or on the website of the Honor Council and the Student Senate.

8.1.2 Two-thirds of the votes cast at two consecutive meetings of this group shall be required to amend or revise this constitution.

8.2 Every third year the student body shall have an opportunity to reaffirm or reject the Honor Code in a referendum held during regular student government elections.

8.2.1 A simple majority of the votes cast will decide the referendum. A majority vote reaffirming the Honor Code will continue the Honor Code in operation until the next scheduled referendum.

8.2.1.1 Should the Honor Code be rejected by the majority of students voting, a second referendum shall be held during student government elections one year later.

8.2.1.2 If the majority of students voting again reject the Honor Code, the Honor Code shall be abolished, and responsibility for maintaining academic integrity shall immediately revert to the faculty.

8.2.1.3 If, on the other hand, the majority of students voting reaffirm the Honor Code at the second referendum, the Honor Code shall continue in force until the next regular referendum three years thereafter.

8.2.2 The referendum shall take the following form:

The Constitution under which the Honor Code functions at Luther College specifies that the Honor Code shall be referred to the student body every third year for reaffirmation or rejection. A vote to reject the Honor Code must be confirmed in a second referendum one year later before becoming effective.

In accordance with the Constitution, therefore, the following alternatives are hereby offered. Check the one which most nearly expresses your opinion. Leave the other one blank.

 The student body of Luther College shall continue to assume responsibility for maintaining academic integrity through the Honor Code.

 The responsibility for maintaining academic integrity shall be returned to the faculty of Luther College.

8.2.3 If a second referendum becomes necessary, it shall take the following form:

One year ago, the student body of Luther College voted to reject the Honor Code. The Constitution under which the Honor Code functions at Luther College specifies that a vote to reject the Honor Code must be confirmed in a second referendum one year later before becoming effective.

In accordance with the Constitution, therefore, the following alternatives are hereby offered. Check the one which most nearly expresses your opinion. Leave the other one blank.

 The student body of Luther College shall continue to assume responsibility for maintaining academic integrity through the Honor Code.

 The responsibility for maintaining academic integrity shall be returned to the faculty of Luther College.

Appendix I – Plagiarism

The Honor Code applies to all aspects of a student's academic life. This means that all tests, quizzes, examinations, and assigned written or oral work of any kind is expected to be the work of the student alone (unless otherwise assigned or approved) and that failure to observe this requirement shall be considered a violation of the Honor Code. The Honor Code prohibits the giving or receiving of information to or from students who write the test at another time. To forestall unintentional violations of academic integrity so far as possible, the concept of plagiarism needs some discussion and definition here.

Plagiarism of any sort involves presenting someone else's intellectual output as one's own, including the use of artificial intelligence. One kind consists in unauthorized collaboration on an assignment. Discussing and studying together are legitimate and desirable. But joint efforts should not extend to planning and writing something together that is supposed to show one's individual grasp of the matter at hand (unless the assignment specifically requires such collaboration).

Another kind of plagiarism consists in using someone else's work (in whole or in part) in a test, a paper, a lab report, or some other context where one is expected to be doing independent work. The most obvious form is to quote someone else's exact words (or use data, or a diagram, or a musical score, etc.) without showing that the material is borrowed. But it is also plagiarism to rewrite (paraphrase) someone else's ideas, or follow someone else's plan of development, or present someone else's argument, without acknowledging the source; changing the wording does not cancel the debt. Of course, matters of common knowledge need not be credited to a source. To be safe, however, one should not assume anything is common knowledge unless one has seen it mentioned in print more than once without a reference to some other source of information. The usual form for showing such debts is a footnote, giving at least the name of the author, the title of the work, and the exact page. (Customs governing what should be included in the note vary somewhat from one subject field to another; the departments of instruction can provide information about their particular requirements.) Direct quotations must always be indicated: short quotations should be enclosed in quotation marks, and longer ones should be set off from the writer's own text by indentation. (Generally, quotation marks are required if one quotes three or more words from a sentence; however, if it is significant, even a single quoted word should be set off in quotation marks.)