

Honor Code

**University of
Baltimore
School of Law**

**UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE
SCHOOL OF LAW
HONOR CODE PLEDGE**

I understand my rights and responsibilities as set forth in the Honor Code of the University of Baltimore School of Law and I affirm that I will conduct myself in accordance with the Honor Code.

I understand that the strength of the legal profession depends on the character of its members. I therefore also affirm that I will comport myself honorably and with integrity in my personal and professional life, as a law student and in my career as a lawyer.

School of Law Honor Code

~~Approved by Dean August 1, 2024; Approved by Office of the Attorney General August 1, 2024;~~
Effective date: August 1, 2024.

Table of Contents

I.	Purpose	3
II.	Notice of Honor Code Provisions	3
III.	Definitions	3
IV.	Prohibited Conduct	3
A.	Plagiarism	4
B.	Cheating	4
C.	Misuse of Materials	5
D.	Communications regarding examinations	5
E.	Misrepresentation	5
F.	Impeding the Honor Code Process	6
V.	Proceedings	6
A.	Complaint	6
B.	Investigation	8
C.	Preliminary Review Panel	8
D.	Hearing	10
E.	Outcomes	12
F.	Appeals	13
G.	Confidentiality	14
H.	Discovery of New Evidence	14
VI.	Reports to Bar Examiners	15
A.	Records retention	15
B.	Bar Applications	15
VII.	Members of the Student Honor Board	15
A.	Selection of Honor Board members	15
B.	Composition of the Honor Board	16
VIII.	Miscellaneous Provisions	16

I. Purpose

The University of Baltimore School of Law prides itself on maintaining high standards of academic and professional responsibility. The Honor Code presumes that all students will embody the principles of honesty and personal responsibility during their legal education. The Honor Code sets out specific guidelines that will govern student conduct with regard to academic integrity. The Honor Code creates and defines the administrative structure in which matters of academic dishonesty are addressed by the law school community, and it establishes an Honor Board that is charged with implementing the procedures.

II. Notice of Honor Code Provisions

All students are on notice of this Honor Code and its provisions by virtue of enrollment at the School of Law. Copies will be distributed at orientation, are placed on reserve in the Library, are available at the Office of Academic Affairs, and are available online. All students should also be aware that a record of academic dishonesty is an extremely serious obstacle to a student's gaining admission to the practice of law. All students have a duty to promptly report conduct reasonably believed to be a violation of the Honor Code.

III. Definitions

- A. "The Dean" shall mean the Dean of the Law School.
- B. "Advisor" shall mean the Honor Board Advisor, who is also the Dean of Students for the Law School.
- C. "Respondent" shall mean a student suspected of an Honor Code violation.
- D. "Examination" shall include any graded test or assignment, or any work required or performed for academic credit.
- E. "Investigator" shall mean a person(s) who is charged with being a neutral finder of facts of alleged violations.
- F. "Business Day" shall mean any weekday on which the School of Law is open for classes, and shall not include holidays, breaks or days closed for inclement weather.
- G. "Chairperson" shall mean the Honor Board Chairperson, an Honor Board member selected by their Honor Board peers to serve in the leadership role for the academic year.
- H. "Panel" shall mean Preliminary Review Panel, which is comprised of three Honor Board members tasked with determining whether the Investigator has offered sufficient evidence to support a prima facie case that an Honor Code violation has occurred.

IV. Prohibited Conduct

An honor code violation demonstrates a lapse in professional judgment and may have a serious adverse effect on a student's professional career. In this context, except as otherwise specified

below, to be responsible for an honor code violation, a student must be found to have engaged in the prohibited conduct with purpose, knowledge, recklessness or negligence. Students suspected of a violation are presumed to have acted without violating the Honor Code unless proven otherwise, or unless the contrary presumption is clearly stated in the code.

It shall be a violation of the Honor Code to engage in any of the following academic misconduct:

- A. **Plagiarism.** Plagiarism is misrepresenting the work of another as one's own. Examples include—but are not limited to—submission of papers purchased or downloaded on the internet or supplied by others; paraphrasing or quoting material written by another, published or unpublished, without properly documenting the source; misrepresenting another's analysis, synthesis, organization, or compilation of sources as one's own, whether the source is a fellow student or any other author; or using any Internet sources as one's own without full citation and appropriate use of quotation marks; or using text created by generative AI without the express consent of the professor. Plagiarism is a breach of academic honesty and does damage to the student's own education, to the legitimate interests of other students who observe the norms of academic professionalism and to the process of education and scholarship generally. The harms caused by plagiarism are the same whether the conduct is knowing or simply negligent. Law students are adults who aspire to membership in a profession that demands integrity and high standards of professional care. They are responsible for ensuring that their academic conduct steers well clear of the line between original work and plagiarism.
- B. **Cheating.** Cheating includes the giving, receiving, having, or possessing any unauthorized assistance or unfair advantage on any form of academic work. Examples may include, but are not limited to, talking with other students during the administration of an exam, the use of crib sheets or any other materials not expressly authorized by the professor during exams, unauthorized possession of exam materials prior to or after the administration of the exam, and copying from other students' exams, use of unauthorized resources on a research or other writing assignment or in a competition for academic credit when prohibited by the competition's rule, and violating rules provided by a professor or proctor on an examination or assignment.
 - 1. There shall be a presumption, rebuttable by clear and convincing evidence, that any student who possesses prohibited resource materials during an examination, including, but not limited to, crib sheets, outlines, cellular phone, "smart phone", tablet, mobile device, or any other technological device not specifically authorized by a professor for use during an examination has cheated.
 - 2. There shall be a presumption, rebuttable by clear and convincing evidence, that any student who violates rules provided by a professor or proctor on an examination or assignment has cheated.

C. Misuse of Materials.

1. Misuse of any law school library, writing center, or law career development office materials. Misuse includes marking, damaging, hiding, or destroying materials; removing materials without authorization or depriving other students of materials meant to be for the use of all students.
2. Use of another student's or professor's books, class notes, or other study materials without that person's consent.
3. Depriving another student, temporarily or permanently, of that student's books, class notes, or other study materials.
4. Intentionally giving another student false or inaccurate information about class assignments, study materials, notes, or other class requirements.

D. Communications regarding examinations.

1. Knowingly discussing an examination that has been taken with another student who has yet to take the examination or with any person in any place where a reasonable person should realize that the conversation could be heard by another student who has not yet taken the examination. Any student who learns, intentionally or accidentally, of any question or answer to an exam not yet taken must report this information immediately to the professor, administrator or staff member responsible for supervising the examination or to the Dean's Office. A failure to so report is a violation of this provision.
2. Knowingly discussing an examination that has not been taken (but is scheduled to be taken) with another student who has already taken the examination.

E. Misrepresentation. Misrepresentation includes but is not limited to:

1. Misrepresenting one's own or another's class attendance or falsifying attendance records;
2. Misrepresentation of one's own credentials, academic record, class standing or extracurricular experience including, but not limited to misrepresentation on a resume, transcript, a job application, or a cover letter.

3. Misrepresentation to any member of the Law School faculty, staff or administration or to any supervising attorney in the case of clinics or internships of any matter pertinent to satisfaction of employment or course requirements, including, but not limited to, the number of hours worked.

F. **Impeding the Honor Code Process.** A student who engages in the following misconduct shall be considered to be impeding the Honor Code Process:

1. Failing to reveal fully any knowledge or evidence concerning an alleged violation on proper request of an Investigator, the Hearing Committee, or any Respondent or his or her representative.
2. Knowingly misstating or misrepresenting a material fact in testimony or a written statement given during an investigation or a hearing of an alleged violation of this Code.
3. Knowingly filing a false complaint of a violation of this Code.
4. Knowingly failing or refusing to comply with any order of an Investigator or the Hearing Committee.

V. Proceedings

Every stage of the proceedings shall be conducted without unnecessary delay. All parties shall act as expeditiously as possible, consistent with the purposes of the Honor Code. Persons who become aware of possible violations of the Honor Code shall report such violations promptly.

A. Complaint

1. Complaints may be made by students, faculty, administrators, staff members or the Advisor and shall be reported in writing to the Honor Board Chairperson (hereinafter the Chairperson), or to the Advisor.
2. The complaint shall describe the incident, shall state the date(s), time(s), place(s), person(s) involved (by name, if known, otherwise by description) and potential witnesses, and shall be signed and dated by the complainant.
3. Upon agreement, the Chairperson and the Advisor, in their discretion, may dismiss immediately a complaint that does not allege academic misconduct or fall within the purview of the Honor Code. They shall send notice of the dismissal to the Respondent. The dismissal shall not be reported to the Board of Bar Examiners.

4. Timeline
 - a. Fall Semester: If a complaint is made and not dismissed, the Chairperson or Advisor shall send a notice of the complaint to the Respondent. For a complaint made on or before the last day of classes for the fall semester, the notice must be sent no later than ten (10) Business Days after the complaint is filed. For a complaint made after the last day of classes for the fall semester, the notice must be sent no later than ten (10) Business Days after first day of the spring semester.
 - b. Spring Semester: If a complaint is made and not dismissed, the Chairperson or Advisor shall send a notice of the complaint to the Respondent. For a complaint made on or before the last day of classes for the spring semester, the notice must be sent no later than ten (10) Business Days after the complaint is filed. For a complaint made after the last day of classes for the spring semester, the notice must be sent no later than ten (10) Business Days after the first day of the fall semester unless the Special Rule in d., below, applies.
 - c. Summer Semester: For complaints filed after the last day of classes for the spring semester and before the end of the exam period for the summer semester, the notice of the complaint shall be sent to the Respondent no later than ten (10) Business Days after the first day of the fall semester unless the Special Rule in d., below, applies.
 - d. Special Rule: For complaints filed after the last day of classes for the spring semester and before the end of the exam period for the summer semester, a different procedure is allowed. If the Respondent, Honor Board members, potential witnesses, and faculty are available during the summer semester, the notice shall be sent no later than ten (10) days of filing the complaint.
 - e. Date of Notice: The date of notice to the Respondent shall be the starting date for the Investigation, Preliminary Review Panel and Hearing timetables, set out in Sections B, C, and D, below.
5. Notice of the complaint shall be sent via official University Communication means (University email) and shall include the following:
 - a. A description of the alleged conduct that constituted the charged Honor Code violation;
 - b. Identification of specific Honor Code sections alleged to have been violated;
 - c. Names of the student investigator and members of the Preliminary Review Panel;
 - d. That the Respondent is entitled to be represented by counsel or other representative;
 - e. That the Respondent is entitled to consult with the designated "Process Aide" for advice about the process and procedure;
 - f. That the Respondent is under no obligation to admit or deny the charges or to make any other statement;
 - g. That any statement the Respondent makes may be used against

- him/her;
 - h. That the Respondent may concede the alleged action(s) that is the subject of the complaint and waive his/her right to a hearing on the merits and proceed with a hearing on sanctions only.
6. Upon notice of the complaint, the Respondent may request the recusal of any investigator or members of the Preliminary Review Panel on the grounds of potential bias.
7. Complaints against graduates or others no longer enrolled as students:
- a. Except for § V(A)(7)(b), below, no complaint may be filed against a student more than six months after that student leaves the University of Baltimore School of Law.
 - b. If a student leaves the University of Baltimore School of Law and either returns or attempts to transfer this law school's credit to

another law school, complaints may be filed until six months after that student graduates from any law school.

B. Investigation

1. Within a reasonable period of time after the filing of the complaint, the Chairperson or Advisor shall select one member of the Honor Board to serve as Investigator for the matter, and shall select three (3) student members of the Honor Board to serve as the Preliminary Review Panel.
2. Any Honor Board member who could potentially be called as a witness in the matter, or who has a professional or personal relationship with the Respondent that would create, or give the appearance of creating, an unfair bias, must be recused from all proceedings relating to the matter.
3. The Investigator shall complete the investigation within twenty (20) Business Days of notice to the student, unless an extension for good cause is granted by the Chairperson. The Respondent shall be notified of any extension of time.
4. The Investigator shall interview all relevant witnesses, the Respondent, and any witnesses then proffered by the Respondent and shall prepare an investigation report. The investigation report shall consist of a written statement approved by each witness, and any other relevant information collected by the investigator.
5. During the investigation, the Respondent shall not have the right to be informed of the name of the complainant, but shall be informed of the name of the complainant if the Preliminary Review Panel finds sufficient evidence to set the matter for a hearing. All witnesses contacted by the Investigator shall be informed of the confidentiality requirement imposed by Section V.(G) .
6. The Investigator shall strive to be a neutral fact finder with respect to the Preliminary Review Panel. The investigator does not participate in the panel's deliberations

C. Preliminary Review Panel

1. Upon completion of the investigation, the Preliminary Review Panel (hereafter the Panel) shall meet to determine whether the Investigator has offered sufficient evidence to support a prima facie case that an Honor Code violation has occurred. The Investigator shall present to the Panel the following materials for its consideration:

- a. The complaint;
 - b. The investigation report, and
 - c. A written statement submitted by the student, if the student chooses to submit a statement.
2. The Advisor shall attend the Panel proceedings for purposes of clarifying procedural matters, but shall not vote in the Panel's deliberations.
3. **Sufficient evidence - Prima Facie Case.** If a majority of the Panel finds that the investigator has presented sufficient evidence to support a prima facie case that a violation has occurred, the Panel will prepare and deliver a letter to the Advisor outlining the allegation, the investigation, the evidence considered and the Panel's findings. The matter shall proceed to a Hearing.
 - a. The Advisor shall send, via university email, a letter to the student enclosing the Panel's letter. The letter shall include:
 1. Name of the complainant;
 2. A description of the alleged conduct that constituted the charged Honor Code violation;
 3. Identification of the specific Honor Code sections alleged to have been violated;
 4. That the Respondent is entitled to be represented by counsel or other representative;
 5. That the Respondent is entitled to consult with the designated "Process Aide" for advice about the process and procedure;
 6. That copies of all documentary evidence susceptible to photocopying are available and that the Respondent and counsel shall have a reasonable time to examine any evidence not susceptible to photocopying;
 7. The names and available contact information of all persons that may be called as witnesses;
 8. That the Respondent is under no obligation to admit or deny the charges or to make any other statement;
 9. That any statement the Respondent makes may be used against him or her; and
 10. That the Respondent may admit to the conduct at issue and waive the right to a hearing on the merits at any time, in which case the Hearing Committee will hear evidence relating to sanctions.
 - b. The Advisor shall work with the Respondent or their representative to establish a mutually convenient date for the hearing. Once established, the Advisor will provide the Respondent or his/her representative with a list of Hearing Committee members.

4. ***Insufficient evidence - No Prima Facie Case.*** If a majority of the Panel finds that the investigator has presented insufficient evidence to support a prima facie case for an Honor Code violation, the Panel shall prepare and deliver a letter to the Advisor outlining the allegation, the investigation, the evidence considered and the Panel's findings, and the matter shall be dismissed. The Advisor shall send, via official university communications, a letter to the student enclosing the Panel's letter and a notice of dismissal. The matter shall not be reported to the Board of Bar Examiners.
5. If thirty (30) Business Days pass, without an extension for good cause, from the date of notice to the student without a finding by the Panel or admission by the student to the conduct alleged, the complaint shall be dismissed. Notice of the dismissal shall be sent to the Respondent, and shall not be reported to the Board of Bar Examiners.
6. Should exonerating or mitigating evidence or information appear at any point after the Panel has found a prima facie case of a violation but before the Hearing has occurred, such evidence shall be provided to the Respondent and introduced at the Hearing by the Presenter of Facts.

D. Hearing

1. Composition of the Hearing Committee. The Hearing Committee shall be composed of four Honor Board student members and two faculty members selected from members of the faculty who are tenured. A Faculty member may be excused from a Hearing Committee by the Advisor for hardship or cause. Any Hearing Committee member who may be called as a witness or who has a professional or personal relationship that would create, or has the appearance of creating, an unfair bias shall be recused by the Advisor. In cases of related actions, the Advisor in consultation with the Dean shall have the discretion to decide whether to consolidate the hearings of several students or of several complaints concerning one student or to consider them separately. The Hearing Committee shall immediately select a Chair from among the student members.
2. Rights of Respondents.
 - a. A Respondent may represent him/herself or use outside counsel or other representative. Current members of the full-time or part-time faculty may not represent students before the Hearing Committee or on an appeal of an Honor Board proceeding.

- b. The Dean annually shall appoint a full-time, tenured faculty member to serve as Process Aide. The Process Aide will make himself or herself available to the Respondent in order to provide information about proceedings under the Honor Code, including information about the alternatives that are available to the student at each step. The Process Aide shall not represent any student in proceedings related to the Honor Code.
 - c. A Respondent need not testify, but an adverse inference may be drawn from a student's refusal to answer questions if, under the circumstances, it would be reasonable to draw that inference.
 - d. The Respondent may request the recusal of any Hearing Committee member on the grounds of potential bias. Such requests are to be addressed to the Advisor who shall have final, non-reviewable authority to determine whether to grant the request. If the request is granted, a new Hearing Committee member will be selected pursuant to the procedures of Section V.(D)(1), above.
 - e. A Respondent may admit to the alleged conduct by informing the Advisor or the Hearing Committee Chair. The Hearing Committee Chair shall draft a statement of agreed facts and submit it to the Respondent for review. Upon agreement, the statement shall be submitted to the Hearing Committee for consideration during outcomes deliberation. If the Respondent admits to the alleged conduct, it shall be considered a violation of the Honor Code and the Hearing Committee shall hear evidence relating to and deliberate only about appropriate outcomes, including the factors outlined in Section V.(E)(2).
- 3. Procedures for the Hearing.
 - a. The Hearing shall be a bifurcated hearing in which the matter of sanctions shall be addressed only after the Hearing Committee has determined - either based on the evidence presented or upon the admission of the Respondent to the conduct alleged - that a violation occurred.
 - b. The Hearing shall be informal, confidential and shall be closed to all except official participants. For all proceedings relating to a complaint, the Respondent may be accompanied by counsel or other representative. If the Hearing Committee Chair and student agree, others may be permitted to attend the Hearing.
 - c. An audio recording shall be made of the Hearing.
 - d. All of the materials reviewed by the Preliminary Review Panel, the Panel's letter to the Advisor and new evidence, if any, shall be

- made available to Hearing Committee members at least one Business Day prior to the Hearing.
- e. The Respondent and all witnesses will be requested to be present during the hearing, although witnesses shall not be in the hearing room except during their own testimony.
 - f. The Hearing Committee Chair shall call the Hearing to order, summarize the facts of the complaint and then call witnesses.
 - g. The Hearing Committee Chair shall ask the Respondent (or representative) to present any witnesses, evidence, and statements in the student's favor.
 - h. The Hearing Committee shall have the right to participate in the questioning of any witness, including the Respondent.
4. Deliberations. After all evidence and testimony relating to the alleged conduct has been presented, the Hearing Committee shall meet privately to deliberate and make findings. The standard for establishing a violation shall be clear and convincing evidence that a violation has been committed. The Hearing Committee may only find an Honor Code violation if at least 5 members so vote. The Hearing Committee shall vote by secret ballot, counted by the Hearing Committee Chair.
- a. *No violation.* If the Hearing Committee finds that the Respondent did not violate the Honor Code, it shall announce its finding to the Respondent right away, dismiss the complaint and prepare its decision, which shall include findings of facts. The Hearing Committee's decision shall be provided to the Respondent within seven (7) Business Days of the hearing. The matter shall be reported to the Board of Bar Examiners as "Dismissed after a Hearing."
 - b. *Violation.* If the Hearing Committee finds that Respondent violated the Honor Code, or if the student has admitted to the alleged conduct as described in the agreed upon statement of facts, the Hearing Committee shall meet privately and vote on an appropriate outcome(s) pursuant to Section V.E. of this Code. The Hearing Committee shall then prepare its decision, outlining the basis for the finding of the violation and the outcomes. The Hearing Committee's decision shall be provided to the Respondent within seven (7) calendar days of the hearing. The matter shall be reported to the Board of Bar Examiners as "Violation."

E. Outcomes

1. Upon a finding of an Honor Code violation or upon an admission by the Respondent to the alleged conduct (as set forth in an Agreed Statement

of Facts), the Hearing Committee shall, by a secret ballot vote of at least four (4) members, select one or more of the following outcomes

- a. Written reprimand, to be made part of the student's official record;
- b. Loss of credit for the particular academic endeavor involved;
- c. Loss of credit for the course for which the academic work involved was prepared;
- d. Suspension for a stated period;
- e. Expulsion (or revocation of degree if finding of violation follows the awarding of the degree);
- f. Probation for a stated period (must include terms of probation);
- g. Reduction of course grade, including failure with Honor Board citation (XF);
- h. Community Service (to be specified); or
- i. Any other outcome the Hearing Committee deems appropriate.

2. If no outcome receives the support of four (4) members of the Hearing Committee, the Hearing Committee shall impose outcome 1.(a) above (Written reprimand, to be made part of a student's official record.)

3. In addition to the evidence presented to the Hearing Committee, the Hearing Committee may consider any or all of the following factors when imposing outcomes:

- a. Whether the student cooperated with the Honor Board's investigation;
- b. The nature of the violation;
- c. The degree of premeditation;
- d. Whether the student admitted to the alleged conduct, and/or
- e. Records of previous Honor Code violations, if any.

F. Appeals

1. A student found responsible for a violation may appeal either a finding of violation or the imposition of a particular outcome.

2. Requests for appeals must be made in writing to the University's Office of the Provost within ten calendar days of the emailing of the Hearing Committee's decision to the student found responsible. The Request for appeal must specify the ground(s) of appeal as set forth in V.F.4 below. Requests for appeals will then be promptly transmitted to either the Provost or the Provost's designee, who will be responsible for deciding the appeal.

3. The student found responsible, the Hearing Committee Chair and the Advisor shall have the opportunity to submit materials for consideration on appeal.
4. The grounds for appeal are:
 - a. Findings of a violation are unsupported by substantial evidence in the view of the entire record;
 - b. There was substantial departure from the required procedures which materially affected the fairness or reliability of the decision-making process;
 - c. There is previously unavailable evidence which, if proven accurate, would substantially alter the finding of violation or the appropriateness of the outcome; or
 - d. The outcome imposed is disproportionate to the gravity of the conduct.
5. Potential Results of Appeal:
 - a. Affirming the Hearing Committee finding and the assigned outcome;
 - b. Reversing the Hearing Committee finding, and
 - i. Altering the outcome; or
 - ii. Returning the matter to Hearing Committee for further review with instructions.
6. The student, Advisor, and Hearing Committee Chair shall be notified in writing of the result of the appeal.

G. Confidentiality

1. Honor Board members (students and faculty) as well as the complainant(s) student or faculty member shall not engage in any discussion that is not called for by their functions either during or after a case.
2. The Advisor or Hearing Committee Chair or Chairperson may answer a complainant's reasonable and lawful request for information about the procedural status of a case.
3. Once yearly, the Honor Board shall publicize to the Law School Community findings of violations of the Honor Code in summary, de-identified fashion.

H. Discovery of New Evidence

1. Within twelve months after the imposition of an outcome, a student found responsible for a violation may petition the Advisor for reconsideration based on new evidence that could not with reasonable diligence have been discovered prior to the initial evidentiary hearing. The Advisor, upon concluding both that the new evidence is relevant and that there were reasonable grounds for the evidence not being brought forth earlier, shall convene a new Hearing Committee to consider the new evidence, using the same procedures as set forth above in Section C. Hearing.
2. The new Hearing Committee shall contain as many members of the original Committee as possible.

VI. Reports to Bar Examiners**A. Records retention**

School of Law Office of Academic Affairs retains electronic records of all charges of academic misconduct issued in accordance with this Honor Code, including decisions from all Hearings, as well as the disposition of all such charges.

B. Bar Applications

The Office of Academic Affairs shall report Honor Code violations and/or dismissal to the Board of Bar Examiners as indicated in this Code. Students are responsible for reporting Honor Code violations and/or dismissals on their applications for the Bar Examination.

VII. Members of the Student Honor Board**A. Selection of Honor Board members**

Honor Board membership is open to all University of Baltimore law students whose grade point averages are 2.750 or higher. Members of the Honor Board shall be selected by an application and interview process. The selection committee shall include the current Chairperson and the Advisor.

B. Composition of the Honor Board

The Honor Board shall be composed of a maximum of 15 students, including the Chairperson. Term of service for new members begins the semester, including summer, after the applicant is selected to serve on the Honor Board and continues until graduation unless the Honor Board member resigns or is removed. An Honor Board member shall be removed by the Chairperson or Advisor for good cause.

C. Honor Board Chairperson

The Chairperson shall be selected by majority vote of the current Honor Board members, the Advisor and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. The Chairperson shall not serve on the Student Bar Association Executive Board. The Chairperson shall:

1. Schedule and preside over monthly Honor Board meetings;
2. Facilitate Honor Code procedures in conjunction with the Advisor;
3. Keep and disseminate meeting minutes to members;
4. Report Honor Board general business to the student body and faculty as necessary;
5. Any other responsibilities conferred by the Honor Board.

VIII. Miscellaneous Provisions

- A. This Honor Code shall be publicized to the student body as often as is necessary to ensure student awareness of its provisions.
- B. If any provision of this Code is determined to be invalid, all remaining provisions shall continue in effect.
- C. This Code shall become effective on the first day of the semester following its publication for student review and comment, adoption by the Faculty Council, and its approval for legal sufficiency by the Office of the Attorney General.