

be in any sense a competitor to the commercial publishers since its chief function would be the issuing of books that would not be commercially profitable.”

Thomas J. Wilson, the fifth director of the Press, served from 1947 to 1967 and raised the prestige of the organization at Harvard and in the publishing world. He uttered a mission statement famous in his profession: “A university press exists to publish as many good scholarly books as possible short of bankruptcy.”

The first of many Pulitzer Prizes for a Press book came

in 1939, for Frank Luther Mott’s *History of American Magazines*. The first of many Bancroft Prizes for books about diplomacy or the history of the Americas came in 1951 for Arthur N. Holcombe’s *Our More Perfect Union: From Eighteenth-Century Principles to Twentieth-Century Practice*. Now and then, an actual bestseller slips onto the list, bringing a change of pace and elation to the Press staff. The first of these was Amy Kelly’s *Eleanor of Aquitaine and the Four Kings*, 1950.

In its centenary year, as in recent years, the Press will publish about 180 books, not counting paperback reprints. It’s no peewee enterprise. Some highlights of 2013: Walter Johnson’s *River of Dark Dreams: Slavery and Empire in the Cotton Kingdom*, just out; Gish Jen’s *Tiger Writing: Art, Culture, and the Interdependent Self*, drawn from her Massey Lectures in

the history of American civilization, due in March; the first English translation of Albert Camus’s *Algerian Chronicles*, coming in May; and in the fall Martha Nussbaum’s *Political Emotions: Why Love Matters for Justice*.

Naturally, the Press has had its good days and bad. In his history of the place, Max Hall summed up: “During the centuries since the first printing press arrived in North America, the publishing of books by Harvard has taken several forms, and the maturing of the central publishing department, even after 1913, has been a slow and erratic process. President Eliot founded the Printing Office and Publication Office, and



The Press’s first Pulitzer Prize came in 1939 for volumes two and three (of five) of Frank Luther Mott’s encyclopedic, readable *A History of American Magazines*.

HM Printer’s Mark

HUP has been historically promiscuous with its logotype. View diverse versions through time, including the crisp centennial identity (right), at www.harvardmag.com/extras.



“We All Can Do Better”

“Somewhat more than half” the students investigated for academic misconduct on a spring 2012 final exam were “required...to withdraw from the College for a period of time,” according to a message to faculty, staff, and students e-mailed by Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS) dean Michael D. Smith on February 1. As reported last August, nearly half the students in the course, which had a reported enrollment of 279, were investigated by the Administrative Board for inappropriate collaboration on the take-home final examination. Smith’s February update indicated that of those whose work was reviewed, more than half were required to withdraw (typically, for two to four terms, according to Ad Board regulations); of the remainder, “roughly half” were put on disciplinary probation; and the remaining cases resulted in “no disciplinary action.”

“Let me be crystal clear,” Smith wrote of efforts to clarify and secure adherence to standards of academic integrity: “we all can do better.”

Doing so, the dean suggested, could begin with faculty discussion of recommendations forthcoming from the Committee on Academic Integrity, chaired by dean of undergraduate education Jay M. Harris. That committee has pursued “student-facing” and “faculty-facing” initiatives. The former might include “the adoption of some form of an honor code to guide students,” and the latter, possibly, “recommendations regarding best practices for properly structured and administered assessments of student competency,” along with already-instituted exhortations to pro-

fessors to clarify what sorts of student collaboration on work are permitted. FAS members were scheduled to hear some preliminary findings from Harris at the faculty’s February 5 meeting.

The Ad Board proceeding, focused on student conduct, did not engage those “faculty-facing” issues—such as the expectations course leaders establish for students, the structure and conduct of exams, or other pedagogical challenges. Given the enormous effort involved in hearing this large volume of individual cases, and resolving ambiguities about who said and shared what with whom when, it is also too soon to expect reflection on whether the Ad Board process itself is up to resolving such involved, complex investigations in a timely manner. (Because the final cases were not resolved until just before the Christmas holiday, students required to withdraw were treated as though they had done so by September 30, lessening their financial obligation for fall-term tuition, room, and board fees.) Wider discussion of such problems—essentially absent during the Ad Board hearings last term—awaits faculty and student engagement now.

For a fuller report on the Administrative Board proceedings and Dean Smith’s message (including the full text of his e-mail and links to earlier reports on the cheating investigation), see <http://harvardmag.com/cheating-13>.



Michael D. Smith

BROOKS CANADAY/HARVARD NEWS OFFICE