

HONOR CODE

The Honor Code is an undertaking of the Stanford academic community, individually and collectively. Its purpose is to uphold a culture of academic honesty.

Students will support this culture of academic honesty by neither giving nor accepting unpermitted academic aid in any work that serves as a component of grading or evaluation, including assignments, examinations, and research.

Instructors will support this culture of academic honesty by providing clear guidance, both in their course syllabi and in response to student questions, on what constitutes permitted and unpermitted aid. Instructors will also not take unusual or unreasonable precautions to prevent academic dishonesty.

Students and instructors will also cultivate an environment conducive to academic integrity. While instructors alone set academic requirements, the Honor Code is a community undertaking that requires students and instructors to work together to ensure conditions that support academic integrity.

Academic Integrity Working Group and multi-year proctoring study. There are currently many concerns about academic dishonesty at Stanford. In order to formulate policies that will effectively address these concerns, it is necessary to identify the root causes (e.g., academic pressures, student mental health, etc) and scope of the problem as it truly stands. To that end, the university must provide the institutional mandate and resources (including access to all data deemed necessary) for a multi-year Academic Integrity Working Group (“AIWG”) to fully investigate this matter beginning in Fall 2023.

The AIWG will also carry out a multi-year study beginning within the 2023-24 academic year (between two to four years in duration, to be determined by the AIWG) of equitable in-person proctoring^[1] practices to answer student questions during exams and promote academic integrity by supervising the assessment process.

The only proctoring permitted during this time will be that done under the auspices of the study. Remote proctoring, whether by software or humans through a computer, is not under consideration. The adoption of any policy on proctoring proposed by the AIWG after the conclusion of the study must be as new university policy approved by the Board on Judicial Affairs, the Undergraduate Senate of the Associated Students of Stanford University, the Graduate Student Council of the Associated Students of Stanford University, the Senate of the Academic Council, and the Office of the President.

Intent and design of proctoring study. The study will address concerns about proctor presence and concerns about its absence in view of Stanford’s present academic culture. It will assess the viability of in-person proctoring of exams to reduce cheating and to determine the impact on students taking exams (such as stress). The resulting data will be the basis for future policy proposals by the AIWG to be voted upon by the same groups as at the present.

The study will be led jointly by the AIWG and a disinterested, unbiased external consulting group with extensive experience working with student conduct, campus climate, and DEI concerns. The use of the external consulting group ensures proper and timely data collection, professional management of the data, and continuity regardless of turnover in the AIWG. The precise parameters governing the creation and charge of this study will be determined by both the AIWG and the external consulting group.

The AIWG will advise Stanford administrators and governance bodies on any changes that need to be implemented in relation to Stanford's proctoring policy within one year after the conclusion of the study. It will a) apprise faculty and students university-wide of the study's results and its implications, and b) seek out stakeholder votes as needed for the timely implementation of the data-backed proposed changes.

Composition and operation. The AIWG will consist of four students (graduate and undergraduate, including first-gen/low-income representation) and four faculty/lecturers (especially from departments with the most frequent instances of cheating concerns), along with one person each from the Office of Community Standards ("OCS") and Office of General Counsel ("OGC"). Membership in the AIWG is to be determined by the ASSU Nominations Commission, the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees, and the VPSA (for OCS and OGC). It will meet with stakeholders (student groups, departmental representatives, Academic Advising, etc.) to inform its proposals. The charge for the AIWG is to be set by the same university entities that set the charge for the Committee of Twelve.

^[1] The Honor Code text is intentionally silent on the topic of proctoring, subject to the constraints in this section. Here, proctoring is defined as the reasonable supervision of exams by an exam administrator, and "in-person" includes traveling athletes, SCPD students, and other enrolled students taking an exam off campus.