

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 6, Fall 2014
11/17/14

Members Present:

Hurst Williamson (presiding), Shantan Cheemerla (clerk), Kristin Sweeney, Helen Sharpless, Sarah Frazier, Natalie Swanson, Anika Zaman, Alan Vu, Katie Jensen, Tapsi Seth

Ombuds: Jayme Smith

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of unauthorized collaboration on an exam for a GRADUATE level MGMT course.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Student A's Graded Exam
- Student A's Original Exam
- Student B's written statement
- Student B's Graded exam
- Student B's Original Exam
- Student A's provided materials

Plea:

Student A pled "NOT IN VIOLATION."
Student B pled "NOT IN VIOLATION."

Testimony:

Student A stated that due to connectivity issues, she asked Student B to use her laptop to upload an exam. However, due to time pressure, Student A accidentally submitted Student B's exam. Student A walked the council through the evidence she submitted. She showed that she had saved an exam right before she submitted the exam – consistent with her story that she mistakenly uploaded the wrong file. Student A reiterated that she had no motive to cheat in this case as she had completed the entire exam on her own. Student A also provided the council with a screenshot of her exam. Student A noted that the files provided by the professor had the same file name for all students, which might have led to her confusion in uploading the file. Student A noted that she did not change the file name until she uploaded the file onto Student B's laptop. At this point, Student A changed the file name on her computer; however, when she changed the file name on Student B's laptop, she may have accidentally changed wrong file's name. Student A said that she did not check the submitted file once she had submitted it on OwlSpace.

Student B said that her only involvement in the case was to provide the laptop to Student A so that Student A might upload her file. Student B was next to Student A while Student A was uploading her file.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred.

Council members noted that there was a lot of confusion regarding the naming of files. Because both students submitted the same file, some council members believed that a violation had occurred. Other members stated that this was clearly an honest mistake, and so suggested that a violation may not have occurred. However, the council ultimately decided that the nature of the violation does not change the fact that a violation had occurred.

Vote #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 Council saw no reason that Student A would not be in violation.

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

Yes: 9
No: 0
Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student B committed the violation. The Council found no evidence in to support that Student B is in violation.

Vote #3: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student B is “In Violation?”

Yes: 0
No: 9
Abstentions: 0

Penalty Deliberations:

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. Council members stated that they would mitigate for cooperation shown through both substantial disclosure that helps the Honor Council reach its decision and by bringing in relevant information before the hearing. Council members found no aggravating circumstances.

Council members noted that this violation was an incidental violation, and that a letter of reprimand be recommended to the student. Some members noted that the student should not receive credit for an exam that she did not submit. However the honor council does not have the authority to have a professor grade the student’s actual exam.

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

3 letter grade reduction:	0
2 letter grade reduction:	0
1 letter grade reduction:	0
2/3 letter grade reduction:	0
1/3 letter grade reduction:	0
0 on the assignment	0
Letter of Reprimand	9
Abstentions:	0

Decision:

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

The Honor Council thus finds Student B “Not In Violation” of the Honor Code.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 40 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Shantan Cheemerla
Clerk