Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 11, Fall 2014
December 3rd, 2014

Members Present:
Hurst Williamson (presiding), Claire Bonnyman (clerk), Helen Sharpless, Sarah Frazier, Shayak Sengupta, Alex Metcalf, Shantan Chemeerla, Kristin Sweeney, Michael Jin

Ombuds: Jayme Smith

Letter of Accusation:
The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of trying to gain an unfair advantage for an upper level STAT course.

Evidence Submitted:
- Letter of Accusation
- Student A’s written statement
- Student B’s written statement
- Gradebook File #1
- Gradebook File #2
- Student A’s Midterm 1
- Student A’s Midterm 2
- Course Syllabus

Plea:
Student A pled “in violation.”
Student B pled “not in violation.”

Testimony:

Student A stated that he was in violation and presented a new written statement contradicting his previous one. He had borrowed Student B’s computer to do an assignment and changed his grades using Student B’s access to the course grading sheet on OwlSpace.

Student B did not know that he was involved in the violation. He lent his computer to Student A. After looking back through his OwlSpace history, Student B found that Student A had been in possession of the computer during the time the changes to the grading sheet were made.

Verdict Deliberations:
Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because of Student A’s testimony and the evidence submitted by the professor.

Straw Poll #1: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred?
The Council then discussed whether or not Student A committed the violation.

Straw Poll #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 members agreed that Student B is not in violation because of the evidence and the testimonies of Student A and Student B.

Straw Poll #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. Some Council members decided to mitigate for cooperation due to Student A’s disclosure, but others did not. The Council members then discussed aggravating factors. Some Council members aggravated for deceit of the Council, attempting to conceal a violation, and potential harm of another student. They also discussed whether the violation was a heinous violation. Since Student A could have ruined Student B’s academic reputation and integrity, and already caused him to lose his job as a grader, the Council decided that the violation was heinous.

Straw Poll #4: Is Student A’s violation a heinous violation?
Yes:  9
No:  0
Abstentions: 0

Straw Poll #6: What is the appropriate penalty for Student A?
Expulsion:  9
F in the course and 3 semesters of suspension: 0
Abstentions: 0

Decision:
The Honor Council thus finds Student A “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends expulsion. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to his record.
Time of testimony and deliberations: 45 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Claire Bonnyman
Clerk