

**Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 65-1, Spring 2016
September 26, 2016**

Members Present:

Katie Jensen (presiding), Reece Rosenthal (clerk), Ryan Carlson, Joanne Kim, Ike Arjmand, Stefano Romano

Ombuds: Matt Nobles

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of copying the problem set solutions for a lower level economics course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Syllabus
- Professor Clarifications
- Problem Set Solutions 3, 4, 5
- Student Problem Sets 3, 4, 5
- Course PowerPoints

Plea:

Student A pled "not in violation."

Testimony:

The student stated that he was unable to access the course powerpoints after class. Instead, the student stated that he completed the problem sets with his course notes that he had taken during class. Student A mentioned that none of the course powerpoints contained example problems; the professor would verbally discuss example problems with students in class. Student A stated that he copied down these verbal example problems verbatim. The student stated that these notes were then used to study and answer problem set questions. The student stated that the notes are no longer available, but the notes would contain the examples used in answering the problem sets.

The student indicated that his memory functions in such a way that he remembered specific details from class example problems and then regurgitated those details on the problem sets. The student closed by stating that he did not violate the honor code.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because of the similarity in student problem set answers and solutions

manual answers; specifically, in regards to the exact same punctuation and grammatical structure with identical phrasing and wording – including specific grammatical answers.

Vote #1: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred?

Yes: 6

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A committed the violation. The council saw no reason otherwise.

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

Yes: 6

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

Penalty Deliberations:

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. Some council members did not mitigate. Some found that the amount of assignment 5 in violation was worthy of mitigation due to the amount of the assignment that could be found in violation. Council members initially considered a 2 letter grade reduction to be the appropriate penalty for Student A. However, the Council then considered the student’s previous violation of the honor code. When considering the student’s previous violation, the Council determined an F in the course to be the most appropriate penalty.

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: 6

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

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 an F in the course. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to his record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 35 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Reece Rosenthal
Clerk