Abstract of the Honor Council  
Case 36, Spring 2015  
April 16, 2015

Members Present:
Alex Metcalf (presiding), Helen Sharpless (clerk), Billy Rothwell, Elliot Baerman (observing), Maria Montalvo, Michael Jin, Destiney Randolph, Jacob Schneekloth, Suzanne Wen, Natalie Swanson

Ombuds: Lawrence Cimino, Natalie Danckers (observing)

Letter of Accusation:
The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of attempting to gain an unfair advantage in a lower level CHEM course.

Evidence Submitted:
▪ Letter of Accusation  
▪ Course Syllabus  
▪ Student A’s Original Exam  
▪ Student A’s Regrade Request  
▪ Student A’s Annotated Regraded Questions

Plea:
Student A pled “In Violation.”

Testimony:
Student A said in her opening statement that the evidence speaks for itself and is irrefutable. There is no denying what she did. Her intent was never to disrespect the Honor Council, the instructor, or teaching assistants by breaking the Honor Code. Her intent was not even to receive a higher grade on her exam. She received a previous Honor Code accusation earlier in the semester. Because of the stress she submitted a regrade request in the hopes to gain back a few points and prove that she did not violate the Honor Code after her first accusation.

Student A said in her closing statement that she apologizes and the evidence speaks for itself. She added that the points in question were small and asked that the Honor Council consider the circumstances under which this violation was committed. Overall, the total points that were altered were a very small percentage of the course grade.

Verdict Deliberations:
Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because of the evidence submitted and the testimony provided by Student A.
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 evidence to the contrary.

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. Some members mitigated for the amount of the assignment that was in violation. There was some discussion because the assignment itself was a very large percentage of the total course grade. About half of the Council did not mitigate.

Council members opened by discussing aggravating circumstances. Most members did not find any aggravating factors because Student A was forthcoming in her testimony. A few members aggravated because of the nature of the violation.

Members now entered into a discussion of the appropriate penalty of Student A. Most members considered a 2 or 3 letter grade reduction, based on the weight and amount of the assignment. Some members considered the offense more severe because it was a regard, and felt that the student did not deserve credit for this course, stating that an F in the course was appropriate.

After further discussion, members were willing to move their penalties either up or down to achieve consensus.

Vote #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: 9
2 letter grade reduction: 0
1 letter grade reduction: 0
2/3 letter grade reduction 0
1/3 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 she receive 3 letter grade reduction. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to her record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 50 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Helen Sharpless
Clerk