

**Abstract of the Honor Council**  
**Case 41, Spring 2013**  
**September 11, 2013**

**Members Present:**

Adriana Bracho (presiding), Isabelle Lelogeais (clerk), Katie Stewart, John Cavallo, Shantan Cheemerla, Sam Kwiatkowski, Aaroh Parikh, Mitch Massey, Seth Lauer

**Ombuds:** Ira Shrivastava

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of use of unauthorized resources for an upper level CAAM course.

**Evidence Submitted:**

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Course Syllabus
- Student A's Assignment 10
- Assignment 10 Solutions
- Student A's Assignment 11
- Assignment 11 Solutions
- Expert Deposition A
- Expert Deposition B

**Plea:**

Student A pled "In Violation."

**Testimony:**

Student A began by admitting that he did consult solutions from previous sections of the course, but that he did not do so without independent thought. He used the solutions manual to ensure that he obtained the correct solutions and receive the optimum number of points. Prior to consulting the solutions, he had some ideas about how to solve the problems, but he had not done significant work before accessing the unauthorized source. He procured and utilized the answers knowing that this action violated the Honor Code for the course. In closing, he admitted to his actions and expressed regret.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because his answers were far too similar to the unauthorized solutions to be coincidental, and because he freely admitted to committing a violation of the Honor Code.

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

Yes: 9+1 Observing  
 No: 0  
 Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A committed the violation. The Council concluded that because Student A was the only student involved, a preponderance of the evidence suggests that student A is “In Violation.”

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

Yes: 9+1 Observing  
 No: 0  
 Abstentions: 0

### **Penalty Deliberations:**

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. Some members of the Council thought that the weight of the assignments in question, 8%, warranted some mitigation. Most members agreed that a 2 or 3 letter grade reduction would be an appropriate penalty in this case.

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:	0
F in the course and 1 semester of suspension:	0
F in the course:	0
3 letter grade reduction:	5+1 Observing
2 letter grade reduction:	4
1 letter grade reduction:	0
Letter of Reprimand	0
Abstentions:	0

Members discussed the nature of the violation. After discussion, the entire Council agreed that the blatant nature of this violation, particularly the student’s admission that his actions were a direct result of wanting to get a perfect score on the assignment, warranted a 3 letter grade reduction.

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:	0
F in the course and 1 semester of suspension:	0
F in the course:	0
3 letter grade reduction:	9+1 Observing
2 letter grade reduction:	0
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 he receive a 3 letter grade reduction in the course. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to his record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 40 minutes

Respectfully submitted,  
Isabelle Lelogeais  
Clerk