

Princeton University Honor Committee

Aggregate Statistics, Fall 2021 – Spring 2026 Compiled August 2026

Overview

Allegations of misconduct by undergraduate students on in-class examinations fall under the jurisdictions of the Honor Committee. The Honor Committee is governed by the Constitution of the Honor System, which defines what constitutes a violation of the Honor Code, guides the Committee’s penalty recommendations, and enumerates rights for witnesses and students in question during investigations and rights for students in question during Honor Committee hearings.

Article V of the Constitution requires the Honor Committee “every year...to publish aggregated, anonymous statistics for the last five, indicating the number of students reported to the Committee, the types of violations that are reported, the number of cases that go to hearing, the respective outcomes of those cases, the number of appeals made, and the respective outcomes of those appeals.” This document represents the aggregated data for the fall and spring semesters in academic years 2021-2022, 2022-2023, 2023-2024, 2024-2025, and 2025-2026.

It should be noted that corrections were made to Honor Committee case data from the years 2020-2023 in July 2026 using University records. Previously released statistics reports have been amended to reflect these corrections. As of August 2026, there are some ongoing investigations and hearings from Spring 2026 not included in this report.

By Category

The categories in this section refer to specific alleged attempts to gain an unfair advantage reported to the Honor Committee over the time period of Fall 2021 – Spring 2026. Each case is categorized by the primary alleged violation. The data is divided into three sections for each category: number of reports submitted to the Honor Committee, number of cases moved from the investigation phase to the hearing phase, and the number of cases in which a hearing concluded in a finding of responsibility.

Category	Violations Reported	Violations Moved to Hearing	Findings of Responsibility
Access to exam before testing period	1	1	0
Collaboration	46	20	2
Copying	3	1	1
Doctored regrade	4	4	4
Failure to submit exam	1	0	0

Overtime	5	2	1
Plagiarism	1	0	0
Removing exam from exam room	3	3	2
Unauthorized Use	53	34	23
Grand Total	117	65	33

Collaboration

Students are prohibited from collaborating with each other on in-class examinations. Between Fall 2021 and Spring 2026, the Honor Committee found two students responsible for unauthorized collaboration with a peer. The Honor Committee recommended one semester suspension not served (SNS).

Copying from a Peer

The violation of copying from a peer is viewed by the Honor Committee as of similar severity to collaboration, but is assessed against a student in cases where either (1) another student was not alleged to be a knowing participant in the violation or (2) where the Honor Committee was overwhelmingly convinced one student alleged to have violated the Honor Code was responsible for a violation while failing to be overwhelmingly convinced of the same with regard to the student whose work was allegedly copied. Between Fall 2021 to Spring 2026, the Honor Committee found one student responsible for copying from a peer. The Honor Committee recommended one semester suspension not served (SNS).

Doctoring a Regrade

In some courses, professors permit students to submit regrade requests. Policies vary across courses and examinations; some professors only accept regrade requests if there is a clear mistake in grade, but other professors allow students to “defend” why their responses or solutions should be awarded more points than originally awarded. Professors who permit students to submit regrade requests sometimes photocopy graded examinations before redistributing graded examinations to students. If students attempt to alter graded examinations before submitting regrade requests, professors can sometimes compare examinations submitted for regrade against examinations photocopied before redistribution. In some cases, professors do not photocopy examinations before redistributing them; however, examinations display physical evidence of alteration such as erasure marks or writing in various writing instruments. Between Fall 2021 and Spring 2026, the Honor Committee found four students responsible for doctoring a regraded examination. The Honor Committee recommended one semester suspension not served (SNS) in two cases, one semester suspension in one case, and one semester suspension with censure in one case.

Failure to Submit an Examination

Cases in which a student claimed to have completed and submitted an examination, but a professor claimed that the student in question did not do so fall under this category. Students typically argue their

examinations have been lost by professors; accordingly, the Committee investigates and adjudicates the plausibility (a) a student completed and submitted an examination and (b) a professor lost an examination. When the Committee is overwhelmingly convinced a professor did not lose an examination, it determines by plausibility of method that a student knowingly failed to submit an examination. This constitutes an attempt to gain an unfair advantage because professors typically offer a number of advantage-granting remedies to a student if their examination goes missing. Between Fall 2021 and Spring 2026, the Honor Committee found no students responsible for failing to submit an examination.

Writing Overtime

Students are prohibited from using more than the allotted time to complete in-class examinations as time represents an advantage on examinations. Between Fall 2021 and Spring 2026, the Honor Committee found one student responsible for writing overtime on in-class examinations. The Honor Committee recommended a reprimand.

Unauthorized use of outside materials

Unauthorized use of outside materials may include, but are not limited to, calculators, cheat sheets, cell phones, lectures notes or textbooks, prohibited websites (including generative AI), or other impermissible written materials. In its adjudication of these types of cases, the Committee always considers whether the rules were fairly and reasonably communicated to students prior to the start of an examination. Between Fall 2021 and Spring 2026, the Honor Committee found twenty-three students responsible for unauthorized use of outside materials on in-class examinations. The Honor Committee recommended a reprimand in two cases, one semester of disciplinary probation in three cases, three semesters of disciplinary probation in one case, one year of disciplinary probation in three cases, disciplinary probation until graduation in two cases, one semester of suspension not served in four cases, one semester of suspension not served with censure in one case, one semester of suspension in six cases, and one year of suspension in one case. The penalty suspension (not served) was introduced in the Fall of 2024.

Below is a breakdown of prohibited aids across all reports, hearings, and findings of responsibility:

<i>Category</i>	<i>Allegations Reported</i>	<i>Hearings</i>	<i>Findings of Responsibility</i>
Calculator	1	1	1
Course Site (Canvas)	4	2	0
Generative AI	23	17	10
Internet	2	2	2
Notes	8	4	3
Other	5	4	3
Phone	9	4	4
Grand Total	52	34	23

Plagiarism

Rights, Rules, Responsibilities defines plagiarism as “the use of any outside source without proper acknowledgement. ‘Outside source’ means any work, published or unpublished, by any person other than the student” (RRR 2.4.7). While plagiarism cases typically occur in the context of written papers and essays that are beyond the jurisdiction of the Honor Committee due to the Student-Faculty Committee on Discipline’s jurisdiction over out-of-class academic policy violations, the Honor Committee occasionally adjudicates plagiarism for in-class, timed-essays. The Honor Committee did not find any students responsible for plagiarism between Fall 2021 and Spring 2026.

Removing exam from exam room

Removing an in-class examination from the examination room is prohibited, both because the Honor Code is based upon the principle that students are capable of holding each other accountable, which requires that they be able to observe each other, and because it provides opportunities for students to gain a number of unfair advantages. Between Fall 2021 and Spring 2026, the Honor Committee found two students responsible for removing an examination from the examination room. The Committee recommended a one semester suspension not served (SNS) and a one-semester suspension from the University.

Access to exam before testing period

Accessing an exam before the testing period is prohibited because it provides unfair advantages such as allowing for extra time and the ability to prepare for exam questions beforehand. Between Fall 2021 and Spring 2026, the Honor Committee investigated but did not find any students responsible for accessing an exam before the testing period.

Violation of Exam Procedure

Article II § B.2.d of the Honor Committee Constitution stipulates that “other actions in violation of the policies set forth by the professor” are a violation of the Honor Code. Penalties typically range from reprimand to disciplinary probation. See table on page six.

By Penalty and Appeal

Penalties are determined at the discretion of the Honor Committee, subject to the constraints outlined in Article IV § 1.2 of the Honor Committee Constitution, which stipulates that overtime violations are usually subject to a reprimand unless it is an “especially egregious case.” The Committee is permitted to add censure to any penalty in order to underscore the seriousness of a violation. A student found responsible of a second Honor Code violation is usually expelled.

In the Fall of 2024, the Honor Committee introduced the penalty suspension not served (SNS), which carries the weight of suspension but does not require students to be removed from the University, a subsequent policy violation is not committed.

Penalties

The table on page six summarizes Honor Committee penalty recommendations between Fall 2021 and Spring 2026. This table does not include appeal outcomes.

Appeals

The Honor Constitution outlines two grounds for appeal: procedural unfairness and harmful bias. All appeals are heard from the Dean of the College, with assistance from the Secretary of the University. Appeals may result in cases being remanded to the Committee, which will be instructed by the Dean of the College to rehear the case after remedying for procedural unfairness or harmful bias. Between Fall 2021 and Spring 2026, one case was remanded to the Committee.

Appeals may also result in a reduction of penalty. Between Fall 2021 and Spring 2026, the Dean of the College heard eighteen appeals from the Honor Committee. All penalty recommendations were upheld.

**As of August 2026, not all appeal outcomes for Spring 2026 have been finalized by the Honor Committee and the Dean of the College.*

<i>Category</i>	1 semester DP	1 semester suspension	1 semester suspension w censure	1 year DP	1 year suspension	2 semester DP	DP until graduation	Reprimand	SNS	SNS with censure	Grand Total
Collaboration		2									2
Copying									1		1
Doctoring a regrade		1	1						2		4
Overtime								1			1
Removing exam from room		1							1		2
Unauthorized Use	2	4		1	1		1	1	7	1	18
Violation of exam procedure	3					1		1			5
Grand Total	5	8	1	1	1	1	1	3	11	1	33

SNS: suspension not served

DP: disciplinary probation

Note: some cases investigated for different charges were found responsible and assigned a penalty based on violation of exam procedures. This usually happens when the Committee finds the student responsible for violating the Honor Code by possessing unauthorized resources (e.g. having notes in a closed notes exam) but has insufficient evidence to prove that the student actively used such resources during the exam. Thus, in this table, five charges from “Unauthorized Use” became “Violation of exam procedures.”