

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 63, Spring 2014
9/9/2014

Members Present:

Hurst Williamson (presiding), Claire Bonnyman (clerk), Nick Conard, Destiney Randolph, Michael Jin, Julia Liu, Mitch Massey, Mario Aragon, Shantan Chemeerla

Ombuds: Natalie Danckers

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of unauthorized alterations on 2 exams for an upper level Econ course.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Expert Deposition
- Student A's Original Exams
- Copies of Student A's Exam Post-Re-grade
- Exam Prompts

Plea:

Student A pled "not in violation."

Testimony:

Student A denied the accuser's accusation of changing answers on his answer sheets to get undeserved points. Student A explained his re-grade requests and how he came to his answers on the tests. He showed his original answer sheet and the photocopies of the test as the professor originally received it to show that the answers had been drastically altered. Student A said that he did not change the answers and believes that the professor had a strong desire to discredit his abilities. Student A also said that a third party changed the answers on the tests. In closing, Student A emphasized what he previously stated about the professor's desire to negatively affect his performance in the class.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because there are clear differences between the photocopies of the original exams and the exams turned in for re-grades. Some members noted that there are visible eraser marks on the exams and the expert deposition seemed to firmly believe that changes were made to the exams before the re-grade.

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 point was brought up that the student may not have made the changes but it's possible that the student did not understand that a re-graded exam should not have changes made to it, even though the professor clearly stated that changes should not be made to the answer sheets. It is not up to the Council to decide how the violation occurred and the Council didn't see any reason that the violation was not committed by the student.

Straw Poll #4: 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. The members of the Council unanimously stated that they would not mitigate for anything. They didn't aggravate for anything either.

Council members then began discussing what the appropriate penalty would be for the student. Some members considered that there were 2 exams with signs of unauthorized alterations and remarked that they thought an F in the course, with or without at least one semester of suspension.

Straw Poll #6: 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: 9
 3 letter grade reduction: 0
 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 an F in the course. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to his record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 1 ½ hours

Respectfully submitted,
 Claire Bonnyman
 Clerk