

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 52, Spring 2016
May 9, 2016

Members Present:

Katie Jensen (presiding), Reece Rosenthal (clerk), Alex Metcalf, Haihao Liu, Matt Roorda, Ellen Diemert

Ombuds: Kenton Whitmire

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and B of sharing answers on a pledged assignment for an upper level material science and nanoengineering course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Student B's written statements
- Copies of Exams for both Students
- Syllabus
- Test Problem Statement

Plea:

Student A pled "in violation."

Testimony:

Student A indicated that after the exam was submitted, Student B reached out asking for help. Student A ended up sending the examination to Student B to assist her. Student A indicated that the test was a small portion of the grade.

Plea:

Student B pled "in violation."

Testimony:

Student B indicated that collaboration occurred on one problem. Student B urged the council to consider the amount of assignment in violation during penalty deliberations.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the question under consideration was incredibly similar on both student's exams and the students' testimony supported the accusation of collaboration.

Vote : 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. No one saw any reason to the contrary.

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

Yes: 6
 No: 0
 Abstentions: 0

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

Yes: 6
 No: 0
 Abstentions: 0

Penalty Deliberations:

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. Some council members decided to mitigate for the amount of the assignment in violation due to the fact that it was only a single question on the examination. The council saw no aggravating factors.

The council saw no reason why the penalties for each student ought to be different from each other.

Using the new CPS as the basis of decisions and with some members mitigating for amount in violation, the council members determined the correct punishment as follows.

Vote: What is the appropriate penalty for Students A and B?

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:	5
2 letter grade reduction:	1
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 and B “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that they each receive a three letter grade reduction. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to their records.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 30 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Reece Rosenthal
Clerk