Abstract of the Honor Council  
Case #29, Fall 2014  
May 4, 2015

Members Present:  
Alex Metcalf (presiding), Hurst Williamson (clerk), Mario Montalvo, Billy Rothwell, Michael Jin, Cara Rogers, Matt Roorda, Helen Sharpless, Clark Zha

Ombuds: Katie Jensen

Letter of Accusation:  
The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of unauthorized for an upper level BIOE course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:  
▪ Letter of Accusation  
▪ Student A’s written statement  
▪ Course Syllabus  
▪ Student A’s Exam  
▪ Student A’s Email to Professor  
▪ Student A’s Written Statement  
▪ Professor Statement  
▪ Recreation of Textbook on Floor

Plea:  
Student A pled “In Violation.”

Testimony:  
In his opening statement Student A stated that he wished to apologize for his inability to respect the Honor Code and his professors. Student A apologized for attempting to cover up his violation during the investigative meeting and said that the Fall 2014 semester was Student A’s most difficult semester and that Student A did not seek aid when he knew he needed it.

Student A said that he was having trouble with the exam and was not ready to turn in his exam by the allotted time and that Student A reached for his textbook to attempt to gain aid on the exam. Student A said that his professor walked in shortly after Student A took his textbook from his backpack and that the textbook did not help him on his exam.

In his closing statement Student A thanked the Council for listening to his testimony and apologized to the Council again for attempting to conceal his violation during the case’s
investigative meeting. Student A said that he was willing to accept responsibility for his actions.

**Verdict Deliberations:**
Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because of the material evidence present and Student A’s own testimony.

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 did not see anything 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:**
The Council opened by discussing mitigating and aggravating circumstances. The Council discussed whether or not Student A’s attempt to conceal a violation during his investigative meeting was grounds for aggravation. While Student A did attempt to conceal his involvement during the investigative meeting, Student A’s testimony during the hearing gave substantial evidence to the case and ultimately allowed the Council to determine that a violation had occurred. The Council decided that the mitigating and aggravating off-set one another.

In determining the appropriate penalty for Student A the Council decided that because Student A attempted to gain an unfair advantage on exam worth a large percentage of the overall course grade that Student A’s violation warranted a grade reduction. Suspension was not considered.

Vote #3: What is the appropriate penalty for Student A?
F in the course and 1 semester of suspension: 0
F in the course: 2
3 letter grade reduction: 7
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 he receive a three-letter grade reduction. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to his record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 31 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Hurst Williamson
Clerk