

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 10, Fall 2012
December 6, 2012

Members Present:

Trey Burns (presiding), Isabelle Lelogeais (clerk), Abby Endler, Seth Lauer, Jessica Mintz, David French, Adriana Bracho, Andres Rodela, Hurst Williamson

Ombuds: Ira Shrivastava, Kristi Vu (observing)

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of consulting unauthorized resources and exceeding a time limit in a lower level Physics course.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's Written Statement
- Course Syllabus
- Pledged Problem Set 10 Prompt
- Student A's Submission
- Initial Report from Student in Class
- Yahoo Answers (Alleged Source for Problem 1)
- Jishka (Alleged Source for Problem 2)
- Expert Deposition
- Student A's Course Grades

Plea:

Student A pled "In Violation."

Testimony:

Student A began by admitting to everything leveled in the accusation. She said that she posted the exact question on a website, and both accessed and copied the solution. She explained that she acted out of desperation in order to pass the course. Panicked, she removed the question from the website immediately after it was answered. Student A continued to say that she used the answer as an aid to produce his solution, and did not copy and paste. In addition, the student admitted to exceeding the time limit by 20 minutes. In closing, she expressed remorse for her actions.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because Student A openly admitted both to consulting unauthorized resources and to exceeding the time limit.

Vote: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred?

Yes: 9

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

The Council agreed that Student A was in violation as she was the only student in the case.

Vote: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student A is “In Violation?”

Yes: 9

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

Penalty Deliberations:

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. All Council Members decided to mitigate for the weight of the assignment, as it amounted to a very small percentage of the course grade. A few members also decided to consider cooperation as a mitigating factor, as she was forthcoming. Most members deemed that because two separate violations occurred on this one assignment, a two letter grade reduction would be appropriate.

Vote: 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: 0

F in the course and 1 semester of suspension: 0

F in the course: 0

3 letter grade reduction: 0

2 letter grade reduction: 9

1 letter grade reduction: 0

Letter of Reprimand 0

Abstentions: 0

Decision:

The Honor Council thus finds Student A “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that she receive a two letter grade reduction. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to her record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 24 minutes

Respectfully submitted,

Isabelle Lelogeais

Clerk