

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 58, Spring 2016
May 13, 2016

Members Present:

Reece Rosenthal (presiding), Owais Syed (clerk), Sarah Meadow, Sofia Yi, Bradley Hamilton, Ellen Diemert

Ombuds: Colin Losey

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of an honor council violation on two problem sets 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
- Course Syllabus
- Problem Set 4 and 5 Student A's Answers
- Problem Set 4 and 5 TA Solutions
- Professor Clarification and Addendum

Plea:

Student A pled "not in violation."

Testimony:

Student A stated that the class was straightforward and there was no need to cheat. She denied ever having access unauthorized materials. Student A discussed her past history of doing well in economics courses. Student A gave explanations for the questions listed in the letter of accusation. Student A went into further detail for individual problems, with examples of common phrasing.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation did not occur.

Members looked at individual questions that the professor pointed out. Although the council agreed that many of the examples are unique to the student and the solutions manual, honor council members were divided whether the wording of two questions with similar phrasing could support that a violation could occur. However, based on the sample answers other students submitted in the class, the honor council concluded that not enough evidence supported that a violation occurred.

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

Yes: 3

No: 3
Abstentions: 0

Decision:

The Honor Council thus finds Student A “Not In Violation” of the Honor Code.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 60 min

Respectfully submitted,
Owais Syed
Clerk