

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 47, Spring 2011
8/28/2011

Members Present:

Kaleb Underwood (presiding), Jeff Worne (clerk), John Cavallo, Kate Snyder, David French, Melissa Fwu, Andrew Patterson, Abby Endler, Adam Hartman, Observing: Eli Spector, David Kim

Ombuds: Miranda Nadeau

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of using unauthorized aid on a final exam for a lower level natural sciences course.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Student A's final exam

Plea:

Student A pled "in violation."

Testimony:

Student A began his testimony by confirming the truth of the letter of accusation. He stated that he used his notes on at least three problems, but not for the whole exam. The student went through the exam and did his best to illustrate on what problems he used his notes. He stated his notes were instrumental in his ability to answer the questions. The student testified that he had decided to bring his notes to the exam a few days beforehand.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because of the student's testimony and his written statement. He also pointed out places in the exam where he used unauthorized aid.

Straw Poll #1: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred?

Yes: 9

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A committed the violation. The discussion above was sufficient to determine that Student A committed the violation.

Straw Poll #2: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student A is “In Violation?”

Yes: 9
No: 0
Abstentions: 0

Straw Polls #1 and #2 made binding.

Penalty Deliberations:

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. The council felt that Student A’s cooperation was helpful in determining the outcome of the case and could be a mitigating factor. Some council members felt that the low number of points gained by Student A’s unauthorized aid could be a mitigating factor, but other members felt that even if the student had used his notes and gained no points, it would still be a violation.

The council considered aggravating based on the weight of the assignment and the amount of the assignment in violation. The council also felt that Student A’s plan to bring his notes to the exam could be an aggravating factor.

Straw Poll #3: What is the appropriate penalty for Student A?

F in the course and 3 semesters of suspension: 0
F in the course and 2 semesters of suspension: 1
F in the course and 1 semester of suspension: 6
F in the course: 1
3 letter grade reduction: 0
2 letter grade reduction: 0
Abstentions: 1

Most members mitigated one semester of suspension based on the level of cooperation by the student. The members also felt that suspension should not be removed as a penalty based on the weight of the assignment.

Straw Poll #4: What is the appropriate penalty for Student A?

F in the course and 3 semesters of suspension: 0
F in the course and 2 semesters of suspension: 1
F in the course and 1 semester of suspension: 8
F in the course: 0
3 letter grade reduction: 0
2 letter grade reduction: 0
Abstentions: 0

Straw Poll #4 made binding.

The Honor Council thus finds Student A “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that he receive an F in the course and one semester of suspension. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to his record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 40 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Jeff Worne
Clerk