

1-1-1983

Law School Honor Codes

Fritz Snyder

University of Montana School of Law, fritz.snyder@umontana.edu

Shirley Goza

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.law.umt.edu/faculty_barjournals

 Part of the [Ethics and Professional Responsibility Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Fritz Snyder and Shirley Goza, *Law School Honor Codes*, 76 *Law Lib. J.* 585 (1983),
Available at: http://scholarship.law.umt.edu/faculty_barjournals/35

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Publications at The Scholarly Forum @ Montana Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Journal Articles & Other Writings by an authorized administrator of The Scholarly Forum @ Montana Law.

LAW SCHOOL HONOR CODES

Fritz Snyder*
Shirley Goza**

With the adoption of a new ethics code by the American Bar Association (the *Model Rules of Professional Conduct*¹), we thought it interesting and perhaps significant to see what kind of ethics codes or honor codes law schools have. Law school honor codes would seem to be inextricably a part of current professional ethics and attitudes.

We sent a letter to 170 law schools in the United States asking for copies of their honor codes and for comments. We received 100 replies. Twenty-nine percent of those schools surveyed do not have honor codes, but a quarter of those who do not have one now are working on one (see chart). Gonzaga School of Law commented:

After much deliberation, it was decided that it was best to do without a written code 'per se', since it was already a school policy that students were on the 'honor system'; that is, cheating and harboring of library materials were *not* to be tolerated with expulsion the ultimate penalty. The Student Bar felt that any codification beyond this would be superfluous and therefore unnecessary.²

U.C.L.A. dropped its honor code five years ago apparently because it simply did not function; students looked on "honor" (cheating and so on) as a personal matter.³ At the University of Minnesota, an honor code ratification referendum is conducted as part of the fall registration every year.⁴

However, seventy-one percent of the law schools surveyed do have honor codes, although "honor" goes by different names: Code of Professional Conduct (Northern Kentucky), Code of Student Conduct (Seton Hall School of Law), Code of Ethics (Southern Illinois), Code of Student Professional Responsibility (Stetson and Ohio Northern), Canons of Student Ethics (Richmond), Code of Academic Responsibility and Law Student Disciplinary Code (Pennsylvania), Ethics Code (Chicago-Kent).

Some law schools require signed pledges or agreements:

I have read the Emory University School of Law Honor Code and agree to abide by it.⁵

* Acquisitions/Reference Librarian, University of Kansas School of Law, Lawrence, Kansas.

** Attorney, Spencer, Fane, Britt & Browne, Kansas City, Missouri.

1. 69 A.B.A. J. 1671 (1983). The *Model Rules of Professional Conduct* were adopted by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association on August 2, 1983.

2. Letter from Elias S. Tsipras, President, Student Bar Association, Gonzaga University School of Law, to authors (1982).

3. Letter from Frederick E. Smith, U.C.L.A. School of Law, to authors (1982).

4. University of Minnesota Law School Honor Code 9 (June 1981) [hereinafter cited as University of Minnesota].

5. Emory University School of Law Honor Code § I (undated) [hereinafter cited as Emory University].

I, _____, agree to abide by the provisions of the Vermont Law School Honor Code as long as I am enrolled as a student at Vermont Law School.⁶

I have abided by all the provisions of the Vermont Law School in the preparation of this work. (Signature)⁷

This is to certify that I have read the statement of the Honor System of the College of Law, University of Wyoming, and that I understand the same and agree to abide by and be subject to its provisions. (Signed at the time of registration each semester)⁸

I, _____, certify that I have read the 1982 Revised Student Conduct Code and fully understand its provisions. (University of Arkansas at Little Rock—signed at the time of registration)⁹

At the University of Colorado, to register for courses, students must sign a statement that they are familiar with the Honor Code, that they agree to abide by its provisions, and that when any written academic work is submitted its submission is made in compliance with the Code.¹⁰ At the University of Richmond, each student must sign and abide by the following pledge:

In registering as a student in the University of Richmond Law School, I agree to abide by and support the Honor System in all areas of Law School activity affecting my honor, including all academic work submitted for credit, any representations made to members of the faculty or administration, and all dealings with the property of the University or that of my fellow students.¹¹

At the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville, students must simply acknowledge receipt of the Honor Code.¹² At Ohio State,

There shall be an honor code pledge printed on each examination blue book . . . which shall read as follows:

I have not been guilty of cheating, or assisting others to cheat, nor have I seen any cheating during the course of this examination.

Each student shall sign the pledge by exam number¹³

The University of Mississippi terms it constructive knowledge: the fact that one is enrolled in the School of Law constitutes a pledge that he or she will in all matters

6. Vermont Law School Honor Code 1 (undated).

7. *Id.*

8. Honor System of the College of Law, University of Wyoming 2 (approved Apr. 10, 1974).

9. Code of Student Conduct for the UALR School of Law, attachment (rev. Dec. 15, 1981) [hereinafter cited as Code of Student Conduct].

10. Academic Honor Code, School of Law, University of Colorado 2 (effective Apr. 2, 1979) [hereinafter cited as Academic Honor Code].

11. University of Richmond Law School Student Bar Association By-Laws 5 (undated) [hereinafter cited as University of Richmond].

12. Honor Code, University of Arkansas School of Law art. III.A. (undated) [hereinafter cited as University of Arkansas].

13. Honor Code, College of Law, The Ohio State University art. III, § B (amended Apr. 26, 1978) [hereinafter cited as Honor Code].

conduct himself or herself in accord with the honor code provisions.¹⁴ At the University of Pennsylvania, registration in the Law School is deemed an agreement of a student's willingness to abide by the code.¹⁵ At the University of Colorado, by agreeing to teach, the *faculty* agrees to comply with the Honor Code.¹⁶

HONOR CODES

If there is an honor code, what should it consist of? Should it be broad and general or narrow and specific? How effective can a code be without a standard? Law school honor codes now are amazingly diverse.

William and Mary's Marshall Wythe School of Law has perhaps the most formal (and attractive) booklet. It is sixteen pages and printed: *The Honor System: Philosophy and Guidelines*. On page one it states: "An honor offense is a breach of the ethical standards of the community. Thus, the penalty normally imposed after a finding of guilt is permanent dismissal from the Law School." The New England Law School Code says:

The Discipline Committee will take disciplinary action when a charge is made that the student has engaged in unbecoming conduct which reflects adversely upon himself, herself, or the Law School.¹⁷

The University of Louisville Law School:

The term honor system may mean different things, but its philosophy may be stated in two words—"mutual trust." . . . It is all too often thought of more narrowly as the unprotected administration of examinations where students are trusted not to give or receive help.¹⁸

The University of Minnesota Law School:

The Honor Code is intended to apply only to academic matters such as examinations, papers, Law Review Service, Legal Aid Service or any other activity which may earn a student credit for graduation.¹⁹

At the University of Richmond, lying, cheating, stealing, and breaching one's word of honor under any circumstances relating to one's status as a student of the University are considered offenses against the honor system.²⁰ (A staff member there made the following comment: "The general consensus seems to be that the code, as it now stands, has not been very effective."²¹)

Some law schools' honor codes are extremely succinct. At the University of

14. University of Mississippi School of Law Honor System § 2-2 (undated).

15. University of Pennsylvania, Law School Student Handbook 40 (undated).

16. Academic Honor Code, *supra* note 10.

17. New England School of Law 1981-1982 Student Handbook: Rules and Regulations 20 (adopted Apr. 10, 1974) [hereinafter cited as New England School of Law].

18. *Introduction* to University of Louisville Honor Code (undated) [hereinafter cited as University of Louisville].

19. University of Minnesota, *supra* note 4, at 1.

20. University of Richmond, *supra* note 11.

21. Letter from Susan B. English, Law Librarian and Assistant Professor, School of Law Library, University of Richmond, to Fritz Snyder (Mar. 29, 1982).

South Carolina, violations of the honor code consist of lying, cheating, and stealing in academic pursuits or within the law school community and the willful failure to report others who do.²² At the University of Virginia, an honor offense is an intentional act of lying, cheating, or stealing which is so reprehensible as to warrant dismissal from the University.²³

An interesting phrase which occurs in several law school codes is "unfair advantage." Thus at Chicago-Kent and Loyola (New Orleans), it is a violation to engage "in any conduct which tends to gain an unfair advantage for any student."²⁴ And at St. Mary's a law student shall not take unfair advantage in academic matters of another student, faculty member, or staff member of the law school.²⁵ (The official comment about this section says this provision is to cover "all conceivable ways in which a student may gain an unfair advantage over another person."²⁶)

The violations of and responsibility for the Code at the University of Pennsylvania Law School are concise and clear:

The Code of Academic Responsibility

Title I: Violations

It shall constitute a violation of this Code of Academic Responsibility for a student either willfully or wantonly to act contrary to accepted principles of honesty in any academic pursuit.

It is recognized that accepted principles of honesty dictate adherence to standards of conduct such as the following:

- (a) no student shall give or secure any information about an examination except as authorized by the examining professor;
- (b) no student shall consult or copy from books, papers, or notes of any kind during an examination except as authorized by the examining professor;
- (c) no student shall fail to stop writing an examination when to his or her knowledge the time allotted for writing the examination has elapsed;
- (d) no student shall hide or mutilate any materials of the library;
- (e) no student shall submit plagiarized work in an academic pursuit;
- (f) no student shall fail to be truthful in his or her statements to faculty or administration on Law School matters.

Title II: Responsibility for the Code

Each student has a responsibility to report any known or suspected violation of this code to a member of the Committee on Academic Responsibility. Failure on

22. The University of South Carolina Law Student Handbook 87 (1980-81).

23. University of Virginia, The Honor System 1 (undated).

24. Chicago-Kent College of Law Ethics Code 5 (undated) [hereinafter cited as Chicago-Kent]; Loyola University (New Orleans), School of Law Honor Code 2 (undated).

25. St. Mary's University School of Law—Student Honor Code § 4.01 (undated) [hereinafter cited as St. Mary's University].

26. *Id.* § 4.01, official comment.

the part of each person at the Law School to assume responsibility for enforcement of the code will render it ineffectual.²⁷

VIOLATIONS

Typically, the honor codes have a couple of pages of prohibited conduct or violations and then many pages of the proper procedures to follow. Thus, the Chicago-Kent code has two pages of violations and seventeen pages of procedures; Mercer has one page of violations and five for procedures; Northern Kentucky, two and eight; Northwestern, one and seventeen; and University of Missouri (Columbia), one and thirteen. The University of Alabama is somewhat of an anomaly because it has five full pages on Standards of Behavior of which the following is an example:

4. With respect to any property or funds which are part of or located in a Law Center building, utilized by or used in Law School programs, held for any law school organization or group of law students, or owned by any law student, faculty member, or university employee, while the property or funds are within a Law Center building, each student shall refrain from:
 - a. Stealing, embezzling or intentionally destroying, damaging or defacing said property. The mere drawing or marking on walls or other surfaces shall not constitute a violation unless done in a manner calculated and intended to cause permanent, substantial damage.
 - b. Presenting any fraudulent claim or application for payment, loan or award of funds or property.²⁸

Violations at some law schools are rather out of the ordinary. At the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, it is a violation to attend class while noticeably under the influence of intoxicants or of drugs which have not been prescribed by a physician.²⁹ At Emory the unauthorized occupation of university facilities is a violation.³⁰ At the University of the Pacific McGeorge School of Law, it is a violation to divulge, without proper authorization, privileged information received in an official capacity on any school committee or hearing board which justifiably establishes the necessity for its deliberations being confidential and so advises the participants.³¹ At Emory it is a violation to use any room or facility owned or controlled by the University or under its supervision or sponsorship as a place for sexual intercourse except for married student housing.³² Also at Emory, habitual petty misconduct, defined as an inordinate number of violations of university rules and regulations, is a violation.³³ At Hastings failing to preserve confidences obtained by virtue of a relationship with the College or through recognized student activity is a type of misconduct.³⁴ At the Uni-

27. University of Pennsylvania, *supra* note 15, at 42.

28. University of Alabama Law School Law Student Honor Code—Rules of Student Conduct 20 (Nov. 22, 1977).

29. Code of Student Conduct, *supra* note 9, at 5.

30. Emory University, *supra* note 5, § III.

31. University of the Pacific McGeorge School of Law Student Handbook 40 (1981-82).

32. Emory University, *supra* note 5, § III.

33. *Id.*

34. Hastings College of the Law, Student Conduct and Discipline 28 (undated).

versity of Oklahoma, it is a violation to smoke in an examination room not designated as a "smoking room" during an examination (penalty: written reprimand).³⁵ At Boston University School of Law:

The sale, offering for sale, or purchase, directly or indirectly, of lecture notes, class notes, case abstracts, or similar material, acquired through attendance at the School of Law, by any student . . . is prohibited and may be subject to disciplinary action.³⁶

Eighty-six percent of those schools that have honor codes specifically prohibit dishonesty during exams or in the writing of papers. At least four schools specifically prohibit the unauthorized submission of work which has already been submitted in satisfaction of other course work (University of Bridgeport, Seton Hall, Vermont, William and Mary). At Bridgeport plagiarism can be the "reckless" copying, submission, or use of material of another.³⁷ At Ohio State no student shall give or receive aid in library problems.³⁸ At Northern Kentucky, Academic Unprofessional Conduct is "any . . . serious and material breach of academic integrity."³⁹ In 1980 at Washington University (St. Louis), the Honor Council, at the request of a faculty member, reviewed a hypothetical situation in which a student wrote notes to a professor during the school year in an unusual ink and subsequently wrote his examination in that ink. The Council's opinion was that any such act which tended to identify a student's examination would violate the Honor Code as it undermined the blind grading system of the School of Law.⁴⁰

Fifty-six percent of those schools that have honor codes specifically prohibit the misuse of the library or its materials. In 1979 at Washington University (St. Louis), the Honor Council determined that placing library materials, which could not be circulated outside the library or which were not checked out, in student library lockers so as to make those materials unavailable to other students violated the Honor Code "to knowingly secrete library materials within the library." The Council recommended that a letter noting the violation be placed in the students' permanent files. The Dean agreed with that recommendation.⁴¹

At Arizona State giving information that is known to be false or that is intended to deceive the faculty is prohibited.⁴² At Seton Hall School of Law, a student shall not make false representations to a professor.⁴³

Eleven percent of those schools that have honor codes have a provision that

35. University of Oklahoma College of Law Code of Conduct 1, 4 (Apr. 15, 1977) [hereinafter cited as University of Oklahoma].

36. Boston University School of Law Disciplinary Regulations 2-3 (undated) [hereinafter cited as Boston University].

37. University of Bridgeport School of Law Student Discipline Code 1 (Nov. 17, 1980).

38. Honor Code, *supra* note 13, at art. V, § B.3.

39. Code of Professional Conduct of the Salmon P. Chase College of Law, Northern Kentucky University 1 (approved Apr. 30, 1980) [hereinafter cited as Code of Professional Conduct].

40. Washington University School of Law Honor Code 14 (Advisory Opinion of Apr. 1980) [hereinafter cited as Washington University].

41. *Id.* at 13 (Honor Council Opinion of Mar. 28, 1979).

42. Arizona State University College of Law Student Honor Code 1 (undated).

43. Seton Hall University School of Law Code of Student Conduct § II. A.12. (undated).

makes it an honor code violation knowingly to falsely accuse a student of an honor code violation.

Forty-five percent of those having honor codes have a provision that makes it an honor code violation not to report a known honor code violation—the so-called “finking” provision. The University of Arkansas has commented on this provision:

This section is written in the belief that an effective Honor Code is impossible without full student commitment to that Code. This section is probably the least enforceable section in the Code, but the section will provide a sanction for those cases where clear violations are known to a student and he has done nothing to stop those violations.⁴⁴

The University of Colorado comments that it incorporates the obligation generally imposed upon lawyers with respect to disclosing information concerning violations by others of disciplinary rules (Canon 1, DR 1-103 of the Colorado Code of Professional Responsibility).⁴⁵ Vermont, on the other hand, has shied away from an affirmative duty to report on violations of the honor code, electing instead to call it a responsibility.⁴⁶ In this connection it is interesting to note that only ten percent of those having honor codes have a provision that makes it an honor code violation to violate the *Code of Professional Responsibility*. And only twenty percent of those having honor codes make it an honor code violation to engage in activities that could amount to a criminal offense.

It is fair to say that standards at Brigham Young University are unique. Law students there must observe University standards of dress and grooming. Shorts are acceptable only in the living and athletic areas. “Appropriate attire will be designated for each student body dance.” Women may not wear levis. Beards are not acceptable. “Mustaches are not encouraged, but if worn should be trimmed above the corners of the mouth. Hair must not cover the ears.” B.Y.U. imposes the Law of Chastity, which includes abstinence from all sexual relations outside the bonds of marriage. And students must observe the Word of Wisdom, which is abstinence from alcoholic beverages, tobacco, tea, and coffee.⁴⁷

SANCTIONS

On the questionnaires received back, there were few comments about punishments or sanctions actually given out for not following the honor code. Washington University (St. Louis), however, in a section on Honor Council Opinions, mentioned that the Honor Council had determined that a student’s putting false information in his resumé and cover letter to law firms stating that he held a position on the law review and had received an award from that law review constituted a misrepresentation of his academic status. The Council found that the conduct was knowing and therefore violated the Honor Code. The Council recommended that the student

44. University of Arkansas, *supra* note 12, at art. IV.A, comment.

45. Academic Honor Code, *supra* note 10, § 4-7, comment.

46. Letter from Victoria Leonhart, former committee chair, Vermont Law School Student Bar Association, to authors (1982).

47. Printed on the reverse side of the Brigham Young University Student’s Commitment and Confidential Report, pt. B.

be suspended for the semester. The Dean agreed with the recommendation.⁴⁸ The student, during the month after that suspension, was given several job offers based upon his falsified resumé and cover letter. He requested that one firm hold open his job offer because he would be graduating from law school later than expected because, he said, of heavy research work he was doing for a professor which caused him to take a lightened course load. In fact, his late graduation was due to his suspension from law school. The Honor Council determined that the student had again violated the Honor Code even though his conduct occurred while he was suspended and not attending classes. The Council recommended that he be permanently dismissed from the School of Law. The Dean submitted this recommendation to a meeting of the faculty, who unanimously approved it.⁴⁹

Sanctions at Texas Tech University School of Law have been imposed several times. One severe infraction on the part of a third-year student resulted in a two-year suspension with no assurance of readmittance to that student. The infraction involved the library. He was charged with having an unauthorized copy of a master library key and of using it to take change from the cash box.⁵⁰ At the University of Pittsburgh Law School, a staff member said that every year at least one person receives some sort of sanction (such as expulsion) for violating the Policy Guidelines on Academic Integrity.⁵¹

Some possible sanctions are in themselves interesting and can be very severe. Washington and Lee's Honor System states:

Although the Honor System cannot be codified, clear examples of breaches of the Honor System are those cases of lying, cheating and stealing deemed dishonorable by the student generation involved. The result of a breach of the Honor System will be permanent dismissal from the University.⁵²

At Wayne State a possible penalty for plagiarism is loss of residency, and reports of all violations are forwarded to bar admission authorities.⁵³ At Willamette College of Law, the Penalty Guidelines indicate that stealing library books may indicate moral unfitness to be a lawyer, but hiding books in the library does not.⁵⁴

HONOR CODE PROCEDURES

Procedures for charging law students with honor code violations are usually spelled out at great length, although in this area details also vary greatly. At William and Mary, if, after a complete investigation, a student believes that a nontrivial charge exists, that student should confront the individual involved and demand an explanation. If an acceptable explanation is received, the incident should be forgot-

48. Washington University, *supra* note 40, at 13 (Honor Council Opinion of Oct. 23, 1979).

49. Washington University, *supra* note 40, at 13 (Honor Council Opinion of Feb. 5, 1980).

50. Letter from Jane C. Olm, Law Librarian, Texas Tech University School of Law Library, to authors (1982).

51. Letter from Marc Silverman, University of Pittsburgh School of Law Library, to authors (1982).

52. The Honor System: Washington and Lee University 1 (1978).

53. Wayne State Law School Academic Regulations, Appendix C—Policy and Procedures in Cases of Plagiarism and Other Cheating (June 1, 1980).

54. Willamette University College of Law Grievance Procedure § V (approved Oct. 24, 1975).

ten. If none is given, then the student should formally accuse the individual and offer the other student the opportunity to resign from the law school or to request a trial by the Judicial Council.⁵⁵ The Valparaiso Law School Honor System provides for discovery and depositions and has a long section on Computation of Time Periods.⁵⁶ Hamline University Law School, the University of Minnesota, and the University of Oklahoma provide for a probable cause hearing.⁵⁷

The composition of the council or committee varies fairly widely. At Southern Illinois, the Ethics Council is composed of six students;⁵⁸ at Boston University, two students and five faculty members;⁵⁹ at Hofstra, three faculty and two students (but students cannot vote);⁶⁰ at Mercer, six students;⁶¹ at Ohio State, seven students;⁶² at Loyola (New Orleans), five students;⁶³ at Texas Tech, four faculty members and three students;⁶⁴ at Tulane, six students and two faculty members;⁶⁵ at Arkansas (Fayetteville), eight students;⁶⁶ and at Hamline, the Dean alone hears the matter.⁶⁷

At Chicago-Kent, the committee consists of five faculty and two students ("much is gained by having seven perspectives on the issues and evidence"), and four votes are needed for conviction.⁶⁸ At Louisville, all five student members must vote guilty to convict.⁶⁹ At William and Mary, four of the five student members must find the accused guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. "[I]n the belief that our community is strengthened by student enforcement of the Code, our Honor System is exclusively student administered."⁷⁰ At the University of Virginia, four-fifths of the student panel, which has between seven and twelve students, must find the accused guilty beyond a reasonable doubt;⁷¹ at Northwestern, two-thirds of the Judicial Council and beyond a reasonable doubt.⁷² At Boston University and Northern Kentucky, the standard is clear and convincing evidence by a majority vote.⁷³ At

55. Marshall-Wythe School of Law, College of William and Mary, The Honor System: Philosophy and Guidelines 3 (undated).

56. Valparaiso University Law School Honor System 6-7, 10-11 (approved Apr. 5, 1978).

57. Hamline University School of Law Code of Conduct § 4.02 (undated) [hereinafter cited as Hamline University]; University of Minnesota, *supra* note 4, at 10; University of Oklahoma, *supra* note 35, at 9.

58. University of Southern Illinois School of Law Code of Ethics 2 (undated).

59. Boston University, *supra* note 36, at 4.

60. Hofstra University School of Law Code of Student Conduct 2 (adopted Apr. 10, 1980).

61. Walter F. George School of Law, Mercer University, Code of Honor and Conduct 4 (undated).

62. Honor Code, *supra* note 13, at art. I, § A.

63. Loyola University, *supra* note 24, at 2.

64. Texas Tech University School of Law Honor Code 4-5 (Aug. 3, 1979) [hereinafter cited as Texas Tech University].

65. Tulane Law School Honor Code 8 (approved Feb. 13, 1980).

66. University of Arkansas, *supra* note 12, at art. II. A.

67. Hamline University, *supra* note 57, § 4.04.

68. Chicago-Kent, *supra* note 24, at 6, 25.

69. University of Louisville, *supra* note 18, at art. III, § D.5.d.

70. Marshall-Wythe School of Law, *supra* note 55, at 3, 11.

71. University of Virginia, *supra* note 23, at 1, 2.

72. The Honor Code of the Students of Northwestern University School of Law art. IV, § 4(5) (undated) [hereinafter cited as The Honor Code].

73. Boston University, *supra* note 36, at 7; Code of Professional Conduct, *supra* note 39, at 5, 6.

New England School of Law, the standard of conviction is "substantial evidence."⁷⁴ At St. Mary's and Texas Tech, the test for determining if a violation has occurred is whether a reasonably prudent person would conclude that a violation has occurred.⁷⁵

Dean Wayne E. Alley at the University of Oklahoma College of Law made an interesting comment:

We have not had an honor code case since my arrival in July 1981. I have been informed that our system is not particularly effective for two reasons. Students are reluctant to report instances of cheating during the course of examinations because it makes them conspicuous. The prosecutorial function has not been well conducted by students. This responsibility represents an inroad into study time, and results in derision from some peers, and has not always been done in a professional manner.⁷⁶

At Northwestern witnesses and evidentiary matters must be presented in compliance with the Federal Rules of Evidence.⁷⁷

At the University of Virginia, if a student, while under pressure, commits a dishonorable act, a conscientious attempt to rectify the situation shall be considered a complete defense if it is made before any knowledge of an investigation.⁷⁸ At St. Mary's, ignorance of the Honor Code is no defense.⁷⁹ At the University of Illinois, there is a guard against double jeopardy: "No student shall twice be subject to University discipline for the same offense."⁸⁰ At Chicago-Kent:

There shall be no plea bargaining between an interested faculty member and a student whom the faculty member believes violated this Ethics Code. There shall be no plea bargaining between an alleged violator and the Investigator.⁸¹

Some codes contain a statute of limitations: six months (Northwestern),⁸² four months unless just cause for delay (William and Mary),⁸³ one year (University of Baltimore).⁸⁴ At Chicago-Kent prejudice from excessive delay may be raised as a defense.⁸⁵

Finally, thirty-four percent of those having honor codes list the rights of the accused.

74. New England School of Law, *supra* note 17, at 21.

75. *Preliminary Statement* to St. Mary's University, *supra* note 25; Texas Tech University, *supra* note 64, at 1.

76. Letter from Dean Wayne E. Alley, University of Oklahoma College of Law, to authors (1982).

77. The Honor Code, *supra* note 72, at art. IV, § 4 (3).

78. University of Virginia, *supra* note 23, at 1.

79. *Preliminary Statement* to St. Mary's University, *supra* note 25.

80. University of Illinois College of Law Code of Student Responsibility 1 (approved Mar. 10, 1972).

81. Chicago-Kent, *supra* note 24, at 20.

82. The Honor Code, *supra* note 72, at art. II, § 3.

83. Marshall-Wythe School of Law, *supra* note 55, at 13.

84. The Honor Code of the University of Baltimore School of Law 4 (undated).

85. Chicago-Kent, *supra* note 24, at 10.

CONCLUSION

With the increasing importance of the *Code of Professional Responsibility* in legal circles today,⁸⁶ an honor code at law schools seems to make sense. We would like to see these honor codes tie themselves more closely to the *Code of Professional Responsibility* than most do today. Surely law school and a career in the law is a continuum with ethics, integrity, and the resulting public trust the polestar for both.

86. Note the large number of states now requiring the passage of a professional responsibility exam.

TABLE OF LAW SCHOOLS REPLYING TO QUESTIONNAIRE

| | Antioch | Arizona State | Boston University | Brigham Young | Brooklyn | Campbell University | Catholic University | Chicago-Kent | Cleveland State | Cornell | Creighton | Detroit College | Dickinson | Emory | Florida State | Franklin Pierce |
|--|---------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|----------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|-------|---------------|-----------------|
| No Honor Code | X | | | | X | X | | | | | X | X | X | | | |
| Working on Honor Code | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | |
| Has Honor Code | | X | X | X | | | X | X | X | X | | | | X | | X |
| Prohibits dishonesty during exams | | X | X | | | | | X | X | | | | X | | | X |
| Prohibits misuse of library | | X | X | | | | | X | X | | | | | | | |
| Prohibits dishonesty with faculty | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Violation to falsely accuse another | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Violation to not report violation | | | | | | | | | X | | | | X | | | |
| Prohibits misconduct in classroom | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prohibits violation of Code of Professional Responsibility | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| Violation to engage in criminal activities | | | X | X | | | | | | | | | | X | | |
| Definitional section* | | | | | | | | X | X | X | | | | X | | |
| Prohibits misrepresentations in Placement Office | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Violation to falsify attendance roll | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sanctions for absences or unpreparedness | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sanctions for Honor Code violations | | X | | | | | | X | X | | | | | | | |
| Prohibits bad moral character | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Procedure for handling Honor Code violations | | X | X | | | | | X | X | X | | | | X | | X |
| Appeal procedure | | | X | | | | | X | X | | | | | X | | |
| List of rights of the accused | | | X | | | | | X | | | | | | X | | |

* Fifteen percent of those having honor codes have a definitional section, defining such terms and phrases as alleged violator (Chicago-Kent), disruption (Cleveland State), complainant (Cornell), petty misconduct (Emory), academic dishonesty (North Carolina Central), student (Denver), academic matter (Minnesota), dean (University of Washington), code (Villanova), and knowingly (Washington-St. Louis).

TABLE OF LAW SCHOOLS REPLYING TO QUESTIONNAIRE

| | George Washington | Golden Gate Univ. | Gonzaga | Hamline | Harvard | Hastings | Hofstra | Loyola (Chicago) | Loyola (New Orleans) | John Marshall | Memphis State | Mercer University | New England | N. Carolina Central | Northeastern | Northern Kentucky |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|----------|---------|------------------|----------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| No Honor Code | | | X | X | | | X | X | | X | | | | X | | |
| Working on Honor Code | X | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | |
| Has Honor Code | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Prohibits dishonesty during exams | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Prohibits misuse of library | | | | | X | X | | | | X | X | X | | | | |
| Prohibits dishonesty with faculty | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Violation to falsely accuse another | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Violation to not report violation | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| Prohibits misconduct in classroom | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prohibits violation of Code of Professional Responsibility | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| Violation to engage in criminal activities | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| Definitional section* | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | |
| Prohibits misrepresentations in Placement Office | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Violation to falsify attendance roll | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Sanctions for absences or unpreparedness | | | X | | | | | | | | | X | X | | | |
| Sanctions for Honor Code violations | | | | | X | | | | | X | X | X | X | | | X |
| Prohibits bad moral character | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Procedure for handling Honor Code violations | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Appeal procedure | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | | | | | | |
| List of rights of the accused | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X |

TABLE OF LAW SCHOOLS REPLYING TO QUESTIONNAIRE

| | Northwestern | Ohio Northern | Ohio State | Pace University | Pepperdine Univ. | Rutgers | St. Mary's | Seton Hall | Southern Illinois | Stetson University | Suffolk University | Texas Tech. | Thomas M. Cooley | Tulane | Univ. of Akron | Univ. of Alabama |
|--|--------------|---------------|------------|-----------------|------------------|---------|------------|------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------|------------------|--------|----------------|------------------|
| No Honor Code | | | | X | | | | | | | X | | X | | | |
| Working on Honor Code | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Has Honor Code | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Prohibits dishonesty during exams | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Prohibits misuse of library | X | X | X | | X | | X | X | | | X | | X | X | | X |
| Prohibits dishonesty with faculty | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Violation to falsely accuse another | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | X |
| Violation to not report violation | | X | X | X | | X | | | X | | X | | X | X | | X |
| Prohibits misconduct in classroom | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prohibits violation of Code of Professional Responsibility | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| Violation to engage in criminal activities | | | | | | X | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Definitional section* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| Prohibits misrepresentations in Placement Office | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Violation to falsify attendance roll | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sanctions for absences or unpreparedness | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sanctions for Honor Code violations | | X | | | | X | X | X | X | | X | | X | | | |
| Prohibits bad moral character | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Procedure for handling Honor Code violations | X | X | X | | | X | | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | X |
| Appeal procedure | | X | | | | X | | X | | | X | | X | X | | |
| List of rights of the accused | X | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | X | X |

TABLE OF LAW SCHOOLS REPLYING TO QUESTIONNAIRE

| | Univ. of Arkansas | Univ. of Arkansas (LR) | Univ. of Baltimore | Univ. of Bridgeport | U. of Calif. (Davis) | U.C.L.A. | U. of Cincinnati | U. of Colorado | U. of Dayton | U. of Denver | U. of Illinois | U. of Indiana | U. of Iowa | U. of Kansas | U. of Kentucky | U. of Louisville |
|--|-------------------|------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------|------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|
| No Honor Code | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | X | |
| Working on Honor Code | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Has Honor Code | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Prohibits dishonesty during exams | X | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X |
| Prohibits misuse of library | X | X | X | X | | | X | X | X | | | | X | X | | X |
| Prohibits dishonesty with faculty | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Violation to falsely accuse another | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Violation to not report violation | X | X | X | | X | | X | X | | | | | | | | |
| Prohibits misconduct in classroom | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prohibits violation of Code of Professional Responsibility | | | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Violation to engage in criminal activities | X | | | | | | | | | | X | X | | | | |
| Definitional section* | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| Prohibits misrepresentations in Placement Office | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| Violation to falsify attendance roll | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sanctions for absences or unpreparedness | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sanctions for Honor Code violations | X | X | X | X | | | X | X | X | X | | | X | X | | X |
| Prohibits bad moral character | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Procedure for handling Honor Code violations | X | X | X | X | | | X | X | X | X | X | | X | | | X |
| Appeal procedure | X | X | X | | | | X | | X | X | X | | | | | |
| List of rights of the accused | | | X | | | | | | X | X | | | | | | |

TABLE OF LAW SCHOOLS REPLYING TO QUESTIONNAIRE

| | U. of Miami | U. of Michigan | U. of Minnesota | U. of Mississippi | U. of Missouri-Col. | U. of Missouri-K.C. | U. of Nebraska | U. of North Dakota | U. of Oklahoma | U. of Oregon | U. of the Pacific | U. of Pennsylvania | U. of Pittsburgh | U. of Richmond | U. of San Francisco | U. of S. Carolina |
|--|-------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| No Honor Code | X | | | | | | X | | X | | | | | X | | |
| Working on Honor Code | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Has Honor Code | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Prohibits dishonesty during exams | | X | X | X | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | | | | |
| Prohibits misuse of library | | | | X | X | X | | X | | X | X | | | | | |
| Prohibits dishonesty with faculty | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Violation to falsely accuse another | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Violation to not report violation | | X | X | X | X | | | X | | | | | X | | X | |
| Prohibits misconduct in classroom | | | | | | | | | | X | | X | | | | |
| Prohibits violation of Code of Professional Responsibility | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| Violation to engage in criminal activities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Definitional section* | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prohibits misrepresentations in Placement Office | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | |
| Violation to falsify attendance roll | | | X | | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Sanctions for absences or unpreparedness | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sanctions for Honor Code violations | | | | X | X | | | X | | | | X | | | X | |
| Prohibits bad moral character | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Procedure for handling Honor Code violations | | X | X | X | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Appeal procedure | | X | X | X | X | | | X | | X | X | X | | | | |
| List of rights of the accused | | | | X | | X | | | | | X | | X | | | |

TABLE OF LAW SCHOOLS REPLYING TO QUESTIONNAIRE

| | U. of S. Dakota | U. of South. Calif. | U. of Toledo | U. of Tulsa | U. of Utah | U. of Virginia | U. of Washington | U. of Wisconsin | U. of Wyoming | Valparaiso | Vermont | Villanova | Washington and Lee | Washington U. (St. Louis) | Wayne State | West Virginia |
|--|-----------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|---------|-----------|--------------------|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| No Honor Code | X | X | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Working on Honor Code | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | |
| Has Honor Code | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Prohibits dishonesty during exams | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Prohibits misuse of library | | | | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | |
| Prohibits dishonesty with faculty | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Violation to falsely accuse another | | | X | X | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| Violation to not report violation | | | | | | X | | | X | | X | X | X | | | X |
| Prohibits misconduct in classroom | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| Prohibits violation of Code of Professional Responsibility | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Violation to engage in criminal activities | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| Definitional section* | | | | | | | X | | | | | X | X | | | |
| Prohibits misrepresentations in Placement Office | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Violation to falsify attendance roll | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| Sanctions for absences or unpreparedness | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sanctions for Honor Code violations | | | X | X | X | | | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| Prohibits bad moral character | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Procedure for handling Honor Code violations | | | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Appeal procedure | | | X | X | | X | | | X | X | | | | X | | |
| List of rights of the accused | | | | X | | X | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |

TABLE OF LAW SCHOOLS REPLYING TO QUESTIONNAIRE

| | Whittier | Williamette | William & Mary | William Mitchell | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|-------------|----------------|------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| No Honor Code | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Working on Honor Code | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Has Honor Code | | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prohibits dishonesty during exams | | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prohibits misuse of library | | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prohibits dishonesty with faculty | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Violation to falsely accuse another | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Violation to not report violation | | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prohibits misconduct in classroom | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prohibits violation of Code of Professional Responsibility | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Violation to engage in criminal activities | | | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Definitional section* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prohibits misrepresentations in Placement Office | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Violation to falsify attendance roll | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sanctions for absences or unpreparedness | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sanctions for Honor Code violations | | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prohibits bad moral character | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Procedure for handling Honor Code violations | | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appeal procedure | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| List of rights of the accused | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |