Abstract of the Honor Council  
Case 44, Spring 2014  
April 16, 2014

Members Present:  
Hurst Williamson (presiding), Shantan Cheemerla (clerk), Michael Jin, Jake Krauss, Nick Conrad, Komal Agarwal, Mario Aragon, Mitch Massey, Sarah Frazier, Kristin Sweeney (observing)

Ombuds: Divya Bhat

Letter of Accusation:
The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of unauthorized copying for a LOWER level CHEMISTRY course.

Evidence Submitted:
- Letter of Accusation
- Student A’s written statement
- Course Syllabus

Plea:
Student A pled “IN VIOLATION.”

Testimony:
The student claimed that she copied a problem on her homework set from another student’s assignment. The student did so during class as the homework was being collected. The homework was graded 50% for completion and 50% for the accuracy of one randomly chosen problem. There are nine homework sets total in the course. The student stated that she copied one out of twenty problems on the homework assignment in question. The student was aware of help sessions, but did not attend any.

Verdict Deliberations:
Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because of the student’s and eyewitness testimony that claimed that the student had copied his homework. Members stated that the Honor Code of the course was very clear with what was and was not allowed in the course.

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 the student should not be considered in violation.
Vote #2: 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. Council members stated that they would mitigate for the weight of the assignment, which was one-ninth of 12% of the course grade. Some council members said that they would mitigate for the amount of the assignment, however others said that due to the unique grading policy that they would not be mitigating for the amount of the assignment. Members stated that they would mitigate for cooperation because the student’s disclosure helped the council reach a decision in the case.

No council members saw any aggravating factors.

Council members stated that this violation in itself warrants a letter of reprimand. However, the student’s actions of reaching into a homework box and taking the work of another student to blatantly copy the homework was an action council members felt deserved some punitive penalty.

Vote #3: What is the appropriate penalty for Student A?
F in the course: 0
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: 9
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 1/3 letter grade reduction. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to her record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 25 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Shantan Cheemerla
Clerk