

## First Referendum--Condensation (Ballot Question)

Shall the Honor Constitution be amended to (1) change the standard penalty for a first violation of the Honor Code from a one-year suspension to disciplinary probation, (2) change the standard penalty for a second violation of the Honor Code from expulsion to a one-year suspension, and (3) stipulate that a violation of the Honor Code involving “extenuating circumstances” will result in a finding of not responsible, instead of disciplinary probation?

“Disciplinary probation” is defined in *Rights, Rules, Responsibilities* as the following:

“A more serious admonition assigned for a definite amount of time. It implies that any future violation, *of whatever kind*, especially but not exclusively during that time, may be grounds for suspension, suspension with conditions, or in especially serious cases, expulsion from the University. Disciplinary probation will be taken into account in judging the seriousness of any subsequent infraction even if the probationary period has expired.

“Disciplinary probation appears on an individual's permanent record at the University (but not on the transcript) and may be disclosed by the Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Students or the Office of the Dean of the Graduate School in response to requests for which the student has given permission or as otherwise legally required.”

“Extenuating circumstances” are defined by the referendum sponsor as “[including], but not limited to, situations where there was a substantial, material error on the part of an agent of the University.”

## First Referendum--Operative Text of Resolution

EXPLANATION—Matter in *bolded italics* is new; matter with ~~strikethrough~~ is material to be omitted.

---

*Resolved by the undergraduates of Princeton University,*

### **SECTION 1.**

Article II, Section D of the Honor Constitution is amended to read as follows:

#### **D. Findings of Responsibility**

1. A student will be found responsible if the Committee finds overwhelmingly convincing evidence that the student ought reasonably to have understood that their actions were in violation of the Honor Code.

*2. A student will be found not responsible if there are extenuating circumstances.*

*Extenuating circumstances may include, but are not limited to, situations where there was a substantial, material error on the part of an agent of the University.*

### **SECTION 2.**

Article IV, Section A of the Honor Constitution is amended to read as follows:

### **A. Penalties**

Students found responsible for violating the Honor Code will receive penalties in accordance with Rights, Rules, Responsibilities as follows:

1. Normally, the first offense ~~will result in a suspension of one year from the University. shall result in disciplinary probation and a recommendation to fail the examination on which the violation occurred. In all cases, the Committee may exercise the option of suspension for two or three years.~~ This rule is subject to the following exceptions:
  - a. ~~Where a student is found responsible for writing overtime on an examination or otherwise gaining a time advantage, the Committee will recommend a punishment of disciplinary probation and recommend that the student receive a zero for the examination. However, in especially egregious cases of writing overtime, the Committee will recommend a punishment of a one-year suspension.~~
  - b. ~~Where there are extenuating circumstances, the first offense may result in a penalty of disciplinary probation. Extenuating circumstances may include, but are not limited to, situations where there was a substantial, material error on the part of an agent of the University, and situations where the Committee fails to conclude that a student should reasonably have understood that their actions were in violation of the Honor Code.~~
  - e. ~~a. If perjury occurs, the Committee may impose a penalty of two years for the first offense.~~ *the first offense may result in a one-year suspension.*
2. ~~Normally, a second violation of the Honor Code, or a violation of the Honor Code following a suspension for a violation of the University's academic integrity regulations, will result in expulsion from the University.~~ *Normally, a second violation of the Honor Code will result in a suspension of one year from the University. A violation of the Honor Code following a suspension for an academic integrity violation will normally result in expulsion from the University.*
  - a. Students whose first Honor Code or academic integrity violation resulted in a penalty of probation may face either suspension or expulsion should they be found responsible for a second violation of the Honor Code.
3. In cases adjudicated prior to the last day of classes, if the final decision is a separation from the University (e.g., suspension or expulsion), the student will normally not earn credit for the semester in which the infraction occurred. If the case is adjudicated during reading or exam period or if the student has essentially completed course requirements while awaiting the final disposition of the matter, obtaining credit for the semester will be at the discretion of the Committee. In such cases, the Honor Committee will normally recommend that the student receive a failing grade in the course in which the violation occurred.

## Second Referendum--Condensation (Ballot Question)

Shall Article III, Section C, Subsection 6 of the Honor Constitution be amended to add that an “[alleged Honor Code violation] case brought to hearing must have at least two separate pieces of evidence, each of which indicates that a violation occurred”?

## Second Referendum--Operative Text of Resolution

EXPLANATION—Matter in *bolded italics* is new; matter with ~~striketrough~~ is material to be omitted.

---

*Resolved by the undergraduates of Princeton University,*

### **SECTION 1.**

Article III, Section C of the Honor Constitution is amended to read as follows:

#### **C. Investigation Procedures**

1. Upon receiving a report of a suspected violation, the Chair will appoint two members on a rotating basis to conduct a preliminary investigation.
2. If an allegation of an Honor Code violation is made over the summer, the Committee will make every reasonable attempt to investigate it in a timely manner. All cases that cannot be practically concluded over the summer will resume in the fall.
3. The appointed investigators may:
  - a. Meet with the student or students in question;
  - b. Meet with witnesses;
  - c. Collect any relevant documents or material evidence;
  - d. Obtain any other information bearing on the allegation.
4. Upon meeting with a student, the investigators will disclose what is currently known of their status as a student in question or a witness before questioning. Should the student’s status change during the course of the investigation, the investigators will inform them.
5. The investigators’ meeting with the student in question will proceed as follows:
  - a. The investigators will explain the rights of the student in question (see III.A. above).
  - b. The student in question will be asked to sign a statement prior to a hearing saying they have been informed of their rights under the Honor Constitution.
  - c. The student in question will be asked to provide an account of the suspected violation in question.
  - d. The student in question will be given a letter, describing the suspected violation in reasonable detail, from the reporting witness. The letter need not be signed.
  - e. The investigators will explain the nature of the suspected violation.

6. Upon the completion of the investigation, the two investigators in consultation with the Chair will determine whether or not a hearing is warranted. *A case brought to hearing must have at least two separate pieces of evidence, each of which indicates that a violation occurred.*

- a. If a hearing is not warranted, all records of the case that personally identify the student in question or any other student will be immediately destroyed.
- b. If a hearing is warranted, the student may exercise their right of up to seven days of preparation.

### **Third Referendum--Condensation (Ballot Question)**

Shall Article II, Section D of the Honor Constitution be amended to add that “a student will be found not responsible [of an Honor Code violation] if the Committee fails to find overwhelmingly convincing evidence that the student ought reasonably to have understood that their actions were in violation of the Honor Code, or if the course instructor explicitly states that a student’s actions were not in violation of their class policy”?

### **Third Referendum--Operative Text of Resolution**

EXPLANATION—Matter in *bolded italics* is new; matter with ~~strikethrough~~ is material to be omitted.

---

*Resolved by the undergraduates of Princeton University,*

#### **SECTION 1.**

Article II, Section D of the Honor Constitution is amended to read as follows:

#### **D. Findings of Responsibility**

1. A student will be found responsible if the Committee finds overwhelmingly convincing evidence that the student ought reasonably to have understood that their actions were in violation of the Honor Code.
2. *A student will be found not responsible if the Committee fails to find overwhelmingly convincing evidence that the student ought reasonably to have understood that their actions were in violation of the Honor Code, or if the course instructor explicitly states that the a student’s actions were not in violation of their class policy.*

## Fourth Referendum--Condensation (Ballot Question)

Shall Article III, Section C, Subsection 4 of the Honor Constitution be amended to require that Honor Committee investigators “disclose [a] student’s status as a student in question or a witness” when “making initial contact” with that student, rather than allowing investigators to defer this disclosure until just before questioning the student?

## Fourth Referendum--Operative Text of Resolution

EXPLANATION—Matter in *bolded italics* is new; matter with ~~strikethrough~~ is material to be omitted.

---

*Resolved by the undergraduates of Princeton University,*

### SECTION 1.

Article III, Section C of the Honor Constitution is amended to read as follows:

#### C. Investigation Procedures

1. Upon receiving a report of a suspected violation, the Chair will appoint two members on a rotating basis to conduct a preliminary investigation.
2. If an allegation of an Honor Code violation is made over the summer, the Committee will make every reasonable attempt to investigate it in a timely manner. All cases that cannot be practically concluded over the summer will resume in the fall.
3. The appointed investigators may:
  - a. Meet with the student or students in question;
  - b. Meet with witnesses;
  - c. Collect any relevant documents or material evidence;
  - d. Obtain any other information bearing on the allegation.
4. ~~Upon meeting with a student, the investigators will disclose what is currently known of their status as a student in question or a witness before questioning. Should the student’s status change during the course of the investigation, the investigators will inform them.~~  
*When making initial contact with a student, the investigators will disclose the student’s status as a student in question or a witness. If the student’s status changes during the course of the investigation, the investigators will inform them as soon as possible.*
5. The investigators’ meeting with the student in question will proceed as follows:
  - a. The investigators will explain the rights of the student in question (see III.A. above).
  - b. The student in question will be asked to sign a statement prior to a hearing saying they have been informed of their rights under the Honor Constitution.
  - c. The student in question will be asked to provide an account of the suspected violation in question.

- d. The student in question will be given a letter, describing the suspected violation in reasonable detail, from the reporting witness. The letter need not be signed.
  - e. The investigators will explain the nature of the suspected violation.
6. Upon the completion of the investigation, the two investigators in consultation with the Chair will determine whether or not a hearing is warranted.
- a. If a hearing is not warranted, all records of the case that personally identify the student in question or any other student will be immediately destroyed.
  - b. If a hearing is warranted, the student may exercise their right of up to seven days of preparation.