# University of Minnesota Law School

# REVISED HONOR CODE*

**As approved by the Honor Code Council in May 2014**

***This REVISED Honor Code is not considered adopted unless the Law School Student Body approves it in an election, to take place in September 2014. Unless and until this REVISED version is approved, the current Honor Code shall remain in force.***

PENDING APPROVAL

## Preamble

Legal professionals occupy a position of immense trust in contemporary society. Clients trust their attorneys with weighty secrets, lofty ambitions, and choices that hold the clients' future in the balance. Legal professionals must engage in honest dealing to faithfully represent their clients and protect the integrity of our adversarial justice system. As part of a self-regulating profession, bar authorities are trusted to shape the norms of behavior to which the members of the profession are bound, control access to certain legal forums, and exercise influence over the makeup of our national judiciary.

The integrity of the profession can and must begin with law students. This Honor Code, drafted by students, faculty and other University of Minnesota stakeholders, is designed to model the Law School's collective commitment to integrity and trustworthiness. Students are expected to behave in a manner consistent with the trust that legal professionals are afforded and to hold themselves to standards befitting our noble profession.

## Article I: Definitions

**§ 1.01 Administrative Resolution:** Completion of an Honor Code Case in which the accused student accepts responsibility for an alleged violation of this Honor Code in accordance with a resolution letter, without a hearing taking place.

**§ 1.02 Academic Matter:** Any activity that contributes to:

(a) A grade, passage of a course, or the satisfaction of any graduation requirement, including activities organized/supervised by other academic units or institutions, if attempted in furtherance of a degree or optional academic certification granted by the University of Minnesota Law School;
(b) Application for membership or publication in a scholarly or professional text;
(c) Supervised research for any member of the University of Minnesota community; or
(d) Personal or professional advantage based on representations about academic performance.

**§ 1.03 Academic Resources:** Textbooks, treatises, outlines, notes, commercial study aids and other hard-copy or electronic materials whose informational content aids in the completion of academic matters.

**§ 1.04 Academic Exercises:** Assignments and examinations.

(a) Assignments: Any graded, scored, or otherwise evaluated activity, other than an examination, that contributes toward a final grade;
(b) Examinations: Any exercise, administered during a designated examination window and used to evaluate a student's knowledge or skills.

**§ 1.05 Instructions:** Directions governing the completion of an academic exercise including, but not limited to, content and formatting requirements, permitted collaboration between students, permitted academic resources, the examination window, the submission deadline, the designated location for an examination, and any additional variance rules.

**§ 1.06 Examination Materials:** Questions, prompts, and other information distributed as a component of an examination, including examination cover sheets distributed at the time of the examination and all materials which must be marked with an examination number.

PENDING APPROVAL

**§ 1.07 Submission:** The point in time when an academic exercise answer has been transmitted to the University of Minnesota Law School or its designee and can no longer be altered or amended by the student. For examinations utilizing designated examination administration software, submission occurs when the student exits the examination file.

**§ 1.08 Examination Window:** The time period during which an examination is available to students who are expected to complete it, including self-scheduled student-submitted examinations, proctored examinations, examinations administered during scheduled class times, and all variance examination administrations.

**§ 1.09 Outcome:** Any result of the disciplinary process including sanctions or their absence.

**§ 1.10 Plagiarism:** Representing the words, creative work, or ideas of another person as one's own without providing proper documentation of source. [In the annotated version, this will contain a citation to the October 11, 2012 Board of Regents policy change which provides this definition and a note about using appropriate legal citation as the preferred way of attributing the ideas of others.]

**§ 1.11 Resolution Letter:** Written communication, sent electronically or in print, indicating the decision of the Honor Code Investigator that a student is or is not responsible for one or more violations of this Honor Code and proposing a specific outcome.

**§ 1.12 School Days**: Days during which the University of Minnesota Law School holds classes.

**§ 1.13 Student:** Any individual currently enrolled in a course at the University of Minnesota Law School or pursuing a degree through the University of Minnesota Law School. In cases where a violation of this Honor Code is adjudicated after an individual's enrollment at the University of Minnesota Law School has ceased, that individual shall be afforded all the rights a student could exercise under this Honor Code.

**§ 1.14 Student-Submitted Examination:** Any examination completed within a specified period of time, without direct test administration supervision.

## Article II: Prohibited Conduct

**§ 2.01 Prohibited Conduct:** The following conduct is prohibited in academic matters, unless specifically permitted by the instructions governing the academic matter in question (including examination and assignment variance instructions).

(a) Any act specifically prohibited by the written instructions governing an individual academic matter;
(b) Plagiarism;
(c) Unfairly restricting the access of other students to academic resources;
(d) Knowingly submitting the same work to fulfil the requirements of multiple academic matters without permission;
(e) Submitting an assignment after the specified deadline without explicitly noting the lateness at the time of submission;
(f) Use of academic resources during an examination, except those resources expressly permitted by the examination instructions;
(g) Inappropriate interaction with others during an academic exercise, including but not

PENDING APPROVAL

limited to:

(i) Discussing an examination with anyone other than the course instructor, the course instructor's designee, or University of Minnesota Law School test administration personnel. Any written or oral communication between students during an examination creates a presumption of inappropriate interaction in violation of this rule;

(ii) Intentionally soliciting, giving or receiving any form of unauthorized assistance in completing an examination;

(iii) Exchanging academic resources with another student during an examination, unless expressly permitted by the examination instructions;

(h) Use of more time in the completion or submission of an examination than is permitted by the examination instructions;

(i) Late submission of any student-submitted examination answer shall trigger an automatic grade reduction of one third of a letter grade (ex: an A- grade would be automatically reduced to a B+);

(ii) Answers to student-submitted examinations, when submitted no more than five minutes after the relevant submission deadline, will not be considered a violation of this provision, except in the application of § 2.01(h)(i);

(i) Retaining examination materials after the collection of examination materials by University of Minnesota Law School test administration personnel at the conclusion of the relevant examination;

(j) Accessing examination materials before the beginning of the relevant examination window;

(k) Writing an examination answer in any place other than the designated location for the examination or removing examination materials from that location, when a location is designated;

(l) Making material misrepresentations of academic performance including, but not limited to, grades, grade point average statistics, honors, publications, or participation in scholarly projects;

(m) Knowingly assisting another student in the violation of this Honor Code;

(n) Violation of any other University of Minnesota or University of Minnesota Law School policy, when such a violation creates an unfair advantage in an academic matter;

(o) Engaging in any other conduct which creates an unfair advantage in an academic matter;

(p) Attempting any act which would violate this Honor Code if successfully completed;

(q) Knowingly making material false statements during any proceeding under this Honor Code;

(r) Failing to promptly report known or suspected violations of this Honor Code to the Honor Code Investigator or her/his designee.

PENDING APPROVAL

## Article III: Disciplinary Procedure

**§ 3.01 Reports:** Students and staff of the University of Minnesota Law School must promptly report suspected violations of this Honor Code to the Honor Code Investigator or her/his designee. Law school instructors are strongly encouraged to report suspected violations of this Honor Code to the Honor Code Investigator or her/his designee or to consult with the Honor Code Investigator to determine if a report is necessary. Any other member of the University of Minnesota community or the general public may report suspected violations of this Honor Code to the Honor Code Investigator or her/his designee.

**§ 3.02 Investigation:** Upon receipt of any minimally credible report indicating a possible violation of this Honor Code, the Honor Code Investigator shall investigate the alleged violation. As a component of that investigation, the Honor Code Investigator shall:

(a) Provide the accused student with written notice of the alleged violation;
(b) Advise the accused student of her/his rights under this Honor Code; and
(c) Meet with the student to discuss the student's alleged conduct.

**§ 3.03 Resolution Letter:** No more than twenty-five school days after receipt of the initial report, the Honor Code Investigator shall issue a resolution letter, including an initial conclusion with regard to responsibility and a proposed outcome.

(a) The accused student may challenge an initial conclusion of responsibility or a proposed outcome by filing a written objection with the Assistant Dean of Students within five school days of the issuance of the relevant resolution letter. The written objection is not required to contain any statement of facts or arguments to support the objection. An accused student may accept a conclusion of responsibility but dispute the appropriateness of a proposed outcome. An objection to a conclusion of responsibility shall be considered to also be an objection to the proposed outcome.
(b) If the accused student does not dispute the initial conclusion of responsibility or the proposed outcome within five school days of the issuance of the relevant resolution letter, the resolution letter shall be sent to the Dean of the Law School and the Dean of the Law School or her/his designee shall implement the proposed outcome.
(c) Resolution letters must be sent to both the accused student and the Assistant Dean of Students. A copy of any resolution letter that includes a conclusion of responsibility shall be delivered to the faculty member supervising the academic matter that is the subject of the alleged violation.
(d) Resolution letters and any subsequent reports on the adjudication of the alleged violation(s) of this Honor Code shall be included in the accused student's file presented to the relevant bar authorities for review of character and fitness to practice law.

**§ 3.04 Hearings:** Honor Code Hearings shall be conducted in accordance with the following procedure:

(a) Hearing Schedule

(i) Within seven school days of receipt of a timely written objection to a resolution letter, the Assistant Dean of Students shall appoint a Hearing Panel composed of two student members of the Honor Code Council and one faculty member of the Honor Code Council who are capable of fairly and impartially ruling on the alleged Honor Code violation in question and designating one member of that Hearing Panel to serve as the chair of the Hearing Panel.
(ii) No more than three school days after the Hearing Panel has been appointed, the chair of the Hearing Panel shall issue a scheduling letter to the accused student, in print or electronically, indicating the timeline for the hearing and the accused student's rights under this Honor Code.
(iii) The hearing shall be held between fifteen and twenty school days after the scheduling letter is issued. For good cause, the chair of the Hearing Panel may reschedule the hearing later than twenty days after the scheduling letter is issued.
(iv) At least ten school days before the hearing, both the Honor Code Investigator and the accused student must provide the chair of the Hearing Panel and the opposing party a copy of any evidence they wish to present and a list of any witnesses they intend to call at the hearing. In the event that such a copy cannot be provided, the chair of the Hearing Panel shall make any arrangements necessary to ensure that both the accused student and the Honor Code

PENDING APPROVAL

Investigator have sufficient notice of, and opportunity to evaluate, the evidence in question.

(b) Hearing Procedure:

(i) If the accused student objects to a conclusion of responsibility, the hearing shall be conducted in the following manner:

(A) Both the Honor Code Investigator and the accused student may each present opening statements, with the Honor Code Investigator presenting first.

(B) The Honor Code Investigator shall present evidence and/or witnesses. The accused student or her/his representative may cross-examine any witnesses called by the Honor Code Investigator. The Honor Code Investigator may offer re-direct examination.

(C) The accused student may present evidence and witnesses on her/his behalf. The Honor Code Investigator may cross-examine any witnesses called by the accused student. The accused student may offer re-direct examination.

(D) Both the Honor Code Investigator and the accused student may make closing statements, with the Honor Code Investigator presenting last.

(E) After closing statements, the Hearing Panel shall deliberate in private to reach a conclusion as to the accused student's responsibility and an appropriate outcome.

(ii) If the accused student objects to a proposed outcome, but not to a conclusion of responsibility, the chair of the Hearing Panel shall determine whether there are disputed issues of fact that warrant holding an evidentiary hearing.

(A) If an evidentiary hearing is necessary, it shall follow the procedure described in 3.04(b)(i).

(B) If an evidentiary hearing is not necessary, the chair of the Hearing Panel shall establish a procedure sufficient to allow both the accused student and the Honor Code Investigator to express their arguments for or against a proposed outcome and to facilitate the Hearing Panel's determination of an appropriate outcome.

(iii) In both 3.04(b)(i) and 3.04(b)(ii) hearings:

(A) The accused student may be represented by an advocate during the hearing, including an attorney, an advocate affiliated with the Student Conflict Resolution Center, or another non-attorney advocate. The accused student is responsible for securing the services of the advocate and for any associated costs. Any accused student utilizing representation by an advocate must give notice to the chair of the Hearing Panel at the earliest possible opportunity, including the identity of the advocate.

(B) The hearing shall be open to only the Hearing Panel, the accused student, the accused student's advocate, and the Honor Code Investigator unless the accused student files a written request to open the hearing with the chair of the Hearing Panel and specifies the scope of the accused student's waiver of the right to privacy.

(C) The Hearing Panel may find a student responsible for a violation of this Honor Code only if such a conclusion is supported by clear and convincing evidence presented at the hearing.

(D) The Hearing Panel's conclusions about the accused student's responsibility and the appropriate outcome shall be determined by majority vote of the Hearing Panel.

(E) A complete record of the proceedings, with the exception of the

PENDING APPROVAL

Hearing Panel's deliberation, shall be kept and made available to the accused student and the Honor Code Council.

(F) The chair of the Hearing Panel shall prepare a report of the Hearing Panel's findings and conclusions. The report shall be sent (in print or electronically) to the accused student, the faculty member supervising the academic matter that is the subject of the alleged violation, and the Honor Code Council, within three school days of the hearing.

(G) If no appeal is filed in accordance with § 3.05 of this Honor Code, the Hearing Panel's report shall be sent to the Dean of the Law School and the Dean of the Law School or her/his designee shall implement the Hearing Panel's recommended outcome after five school days.

**§ 3.05 Appeals:** Appeals of Honor Code Hearing Panel decisions shall be conducted in accordance with the following procedure:

(a) As a matter of right, any accused student may appeal the result of her/his respective Honor Code hearing by alleging that:

(i) The finding of responsibility is based on findings of fact that are clearly erroneous;

(ii) The finding of responsibility is based on an erroneous interpretation of this Honor Code that resulted in prejudicial error;

(iii) The recommended sanction is inappropriate in light of the violation of this Honor Code; or

(iv) Departures from the procedures detailed in this Honor Code caused a prejudicial error.

(b) In order to appeal the decision of a Hearing Panel, the accused student must file a written objection with the Assistant Dean of Students within five school days of the issuance of the Hearing Panel's report. Written objections must specify the grounds for the appeal in accordance with § 3.05(a) of this Honor Code.

(c) Within three school days of receipt of a timely written objection to the result of a hearing, the Assistant Dean of Students shall appoint an Appellate Review Committee composed of two student members of the Honor Code Council and one faculty member of the Honor Code Council who can fairly and impartially adjudicate the appeal and were not members of the Hearing Panel whose decision is being appealed and designating one member of that Appellate Review Committee to serve as the chair of the Appellate Review Committee.

(d) Appellate Hearing Schedule

(i) Promptly after the Appellate Review Committee has been appointed:

(A) The Assistant Dean of Students shall submit an official copy of the relevant hearing records to the chair of the Appellate Review Committee and the accused student; and

(B) No more than three school days after the Appellate Review Committee has been appointed, the chair of the Appellate Review Committee shall issue an appellate scheduling letter to the accused student, in print or electronically, indicating the timeline for the appellate hearing.

(ii) The appellate hearing shall occur between five and ten school days of the issuance of the appellate scheduling letter. For good cause, the chair of the Appellate Review Committee may reschedule the hearing later than ten school days after the appellate scheduling letter is issued.

(e) Appellate Hearing Procedure

(i) The chair of the Appellate Review Committee shall determine whether there are disputed issues of fact that warrant holding an evidentiary hearing.

PENDING APPROVAL

(A) If an evidentiary hearing is necessary, the hearing shall be conducted according to the following procedure:

(1) Both the accused student and the Honor Code Investigator may each present opening statements, with the accused student presenting first.

(2) The accused student shall present evidence and/or witnesses. The Honor Code Investigator may cross-examine any witnesses called by the accused student. The accused student may offer re-direct examination.

(3) The Honor Code Investigator may present evidence and witnesses. The accused student or her/his representative may cross-examine any witnesses called by the Honor Code Investigator. The Honor Code Investigator may offer re-direct examination.

(4) Both the accused student and the Honor Code Investigator may make closing statements, with the accused student presenting last.

(5) After closing statements, the Appellate Review Committee shall deliberate in private to reach a conclusion as to the accused student's appeal.

(B) If an evidentiary hearing is not necessary, the chair of the Appellate Review Committee shall establish a procedure sufficient to allow both the accused student and the Honor Code Investigator to express their arguments for or against the Hearing Panel's conclusions.

(C) In both 3.05(e)(i)(A) and 3.05(e)(i)(B) appellate hearings:

(1) Neither the accused student nor the Honor Code Investigatory may re-present witnesses or evidence that was presented at the initial hearing, except in those cases where the chair of the Appellate Review Committee deems it necessary to resolve an issue on appeal.

(2) The accused student may, at her/his discretion, be represented by an advocate during the appellate hearing including an attorney, an advocate affiliated with the Student Conflict Resolution Center or another non-attorney advocate. The accused student is responsible for securing the services of the advocate and for any associated costs. Any accused student utilizing representation by an advocate must give notice to the chair of the Appellate Review Committee at the earliest possible opportunity, including the identity of the advocate.

(3) The appellate hearing shall be open to only the Appellate Review Committee, the accused student, the accused student's advocate, and the Honor Code Investigator unless the accused student files a written request to open the hearing with the chair of the Appellate Review Committee and specifies the scope of the accused student's waiver of the right to privacy.

(4) The Appellate Review Committee's conclusions about the appeal shall be determined by majority vote of the Appellate Review Committee.

(5) A complete record of the proceedings, with the exception of the Appellate Review Committee's deliberation, shall be kept and made available to the accused student and the Honor Code

PENDING APPROVAL

Council.

(6) The chair of the Appellate Review Committee shall prepare a report of the Appellate Review Committee's findings and conclusions. The report shall be sent (in print or electronically) to the accused student, the faculty member supervising the academic matter that is the subject of the alleged violation, the Dean of the Law School, and the Honor Code Council, within three days of the appellate hearing.

(f) The Appellate Review Committee may modify the Hearing Panel's finding of responsibility or the Hearing Panel's recommended outcome or may remand the case for further review. If the Appellate Review Committee deems it necessary, it may order the appointment of a new Hearing Panel to hear a remanded case.

(g) If the Appellate Review Committee issues or affirms an outcome other than suspension or expulsion, the Appellate Review Committee's disposition of the appeal shall be final and the Dean of the Law School or her/his designee shall implement the Appellate Review Committee's recommended outcome.

(h) If the Appellate Review Committee issues or affirms a sanction of suspension or expulsion, the accused student shall have the right to make an appeal to the Dean of the Law School.

(i) An accused student who wishes to appeal the decision of an Appellate Review Committee must file notice of intent to appeal with the Dean of the Law School within five school days and must file the complete written appeal no later than ten schools days after the chair of the Appellate Review Committee's report is issued;

(ii) The Dean's Appellate Review shall be limited to the appropriateness of the recommended sanction in light of the established finding of responsibility.

(iii) The Dean's Appellate Review shall be conducted based solely on written submission, without the presentation of witnesses or oral argumentation.

(A) The accused student may present up to 4,800 words of written argument.

(B) The Honor Code Investigator may present up to 2,400 words of written response to the accused student's argument, filed within five school days of the student's written appeal.

(iv) The Dean shall consider the appeal for no more than ten school days after receipt of the Honor Code Investigator's response, except when good cause can be shown for further deliberation.

(v) When the Dean has reached a decision, the Dean shall send (in print or electronically) a report explaining her/his decision to the accused student, the faculty member supervising the academic matter that is the subject of the alleged violation, and the Honor Code Council.

(vi) After the Dean's report has been sent, the Dean of the Law School or her/his designee shall implement the Dean's selected outcome.

**§ 3.06 Sanctions:** Upon a finding that the accused student is responsible for a violation of this Honor Code, resulting sanctions may include, but are not limited to:

(a) Loss of credit for the academic matter in question;

(b) Loss of credit for the course in which the academic matter took place;

(c) Change in the grade assigned to the academic matter in question;

(d) Written reprimand;

(e) Transcript notation;

(f) Probation;

PENDING APPROVAL

(g) Suspension;
(h) Expulsion;
(i) Degree revocation.

**§ 3.07 Reporting to University Record Keepers:** When the final outcome of any proceeding under this Honor Code is determined, the Assistant Dean of Students shall report the outcome to other University of Minnesota Offices as required by relevant record keeping policies.

**§ 3.08 Independence From Legal Proceedings:** Proceedings under this Honor Code operate independent of any criminal, civil or administrative legal proceedings that may stem from the same alleged behavior.

(a) Students may be found responsible for violating this Honor Code even if a concurrent or prior legal proceeding did not hold the student responsible for the alleged behavior.
(b) The conclusions of any judicial body hearing a dispute around the student's alleged conduct may be introduced at a hearing but shall not be dispositive.
(c) When possible, reasonable scheduling accommodations should be made to ensure that participation in a proceeding under this Honor Code does not interfere with an accused student's ability to participate in her/his own defense in a concurrent legal dispute.

**§ 3.09 Compliance with Federal or State Civil Rights Law:** If the Assistant Dean of Students, the Honor Code Investigator, or the chair of a Hearing Panel reasonably believe that a specific alleged violation of this Honor Code may also constitute a violation of another student's civil rights, as protected by federal law or Minnesota law, the Assistant Dean of Students shall establish a procedure sufficient to protect the allegedly-injured student's rights.

## Article IV: Administration

**§ 4.01 The Honor Code Council:** Administration of this Honor Code is vested in the Honor Code Council, which shall be composed of:

(a) Voting Members (each serving a renewable one year term):
(i) Three faculty members, appointed by the Dean of the Law School;
(ii) One first-year law student, elected by the first-year class;
(iii) One second-year law student, elected by the second-year class;
(iv) One third-year law student, elected by the third-year class;
(v) Three law students, appointed by the Law Council;

(b) Non-Voting Members:
(i) The Honor Code Investigator;
(ii) The Assistant Dean of Students, who shall chair the Honor Code Council. The Assistant Dean of Students may designate a member of the Division of Student Services as a temporary substitute chair if expediency or equitable administration of this Honor Code so require.

**§ 4.02 The Honor Code Investigator:** The Honor Code Investigator shall investigate and prosecute violations of this Honor Code, in accordance with the procedures detailed in Article III of this Honor Code.

(a) The Dean of the Law School, with the approval of the Law Council and the Law Faculty, shall appoint one member of the University of Minnesota Law School faculty or staff to serve as the Honor Code Investigator.

PENDING APPROVAL

(b) The Honor Code Investigator shall serve until a successor is appointed.
(c) If no Honor Code Investigator has been appointed at the time an alleged violation of this Honor Code is reported, or if the circumstances of the alleged violation prevent the appointed Honor Code Investigator from completing her/his duties in a fair and impartial manner, the Dean of the Law School may appoint an interim Honor Code Investigator without the approval of the Law Council or the Law Faculty.
(d) In cases where an administrative resolution is reached, the Honor Code Investigator shall submit a detailed report to the Honor Code Council.

**§ 4.03 Administration by the Honor Code Council:** The Honor Code Council shall perform the following duties:

(a) Promulgate this Honor Code among the University of Minnesota Law School community by:

(i) Ensuring that all members of the University of Minnesota Law School community have access to a current and accurate copy of this Honor Code;
(ii) Educating all incoming students about the expectations and procedures set forth in this Honor Code;
(iii) Publishing a model Honor Code Compliance Statement to be included in the instructions governing each examination at the University of Minnesota Law School; and
(iv) Regularly informing the University of Minnesota Law School community of the identity of the Honor Code Investigator and the means by which suspected violations of this Honor Code should be reported;

(b) Facilitate and oversee all Honor Code Hearings by:

(i) Training all voting members of the Honor Code Council to conduct fair and effective hearings when a student is accused of violating this Honor Code;
(ii) Receiving a formal report from any Honor Code Hearing Panels for each of their respective hearings;
(iii) Maintaining the formal reports from all Honor Code hearings and making them available to Honor Code Council Members and other University of Minnesota Law School officials as needed;

(c) Protect the privacy of all records and proceedings related to individual students and the enforcement of this Honor Code including, but not limited to, compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99).
(d) Receive and maintain reports from the Honor Code Investigator whenever an administrative resolution is reached in a given case;
(e) Periodically review this Honor Code and recommend any necessary amendments to the Law Council;
(f) Provide regular reports which facilitate the University of Minnesota Law School student body's understanding of and compliance with this Honor Code; and
(g) Perform such other functions as are necessary and proper to ensure efficient administration of this Honor Code.

## Article V: Force and Amendments

**§ 5.01 Force:** This Honor Code shall remain in force until it is repealed.

**§ 5.02 Repeal:** If the Assistant Dean of Students receives a petition for repeal of this Honor Code, signed by at least ten percent of the University of Minnesota Law School student body, the Honor Code Council shall conduct a student body referendum on the question of repeal. If at

PENDING APPROVAL

least sixty percent of University of Minnesota Law School student body casts a ballot in the referendum and the majority of ballots cast support repeal of this Honor Code, all delegated power vested in this Honor Code will revert back to the faculty and the Code of Scholastic Conduct of November 25, 1986 will automatically take effect.

**§ 5.03 Amendments:** If the Assistant Dean of Students receives a petition to amend this Honor Code, signed by at least five percent of the University of Minnesota Law School student body, it must be presented to the Honor Code Council for review. If the majority of the Honor Code Council approves the proposed amendment(s), it shall conduct a student body referendum on the proposed amendment(s). If at least forty percent of University of Minnesota Law School student body casts a ballot in the referendum and the majority of ballots cast support the proposed amendment(s), the proposed amendment(s) shall take effect on the first day of the semester immediately following the referendum.

**§ 5.04 Clerical Amendments:** The Law Council may, at their discretion, make such changes to this Honor Code as are needed to reflect changes in official titles and personnel decisions but do not change the rights or responsibilities of students.

PENDING APPROVAL