

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 65-3, Spring 2016
June 19, 2016

Members Present:

Katie Jensen (presiding), Allison Salter (clerk), Matt Roorda, Dessy Akinfenwa, Angel Garces, Hector Chaires

Ombuds: Carey Wang

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of using problem sets from a previous semester to answer free response questions on problem sets for a lower level ECON course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Class Syllabus
- Problem Set Solutions
- The problem sets turned in by Student A

Plea:

Student A pled "Not in violation."

Testimony:

Student A looked through the questions presented and the problem set solution provided and admitted to some similarity. He stated that he did not have access to the solutions manual. Instead, he stated that he spent a lot of time on the problem sets and went to many different websites and scholarly sources for help to complete the problem sets and gain deeper understanding of the material.

There were five problem sets, but Student A only sought out other sources for #2, #3, and #4. He copied and pasted answers from online sources and the book.

In closing, he reiterated that he did not have access to the solution manual. The syllabus reads "I will be surprised if you do not need help with the problem sets..." and he took this to mean that he could use online sources. He stated that he did not take a shortcut, and he felt that the grade he received was proportional to the amount of work he put in.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because Student A's answers were word for word similar to the provided problem set solutions.

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. As stated before, the solutions were word for word similar and the student admitted to copying and pasting from online sources.

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. No council members will be mitigating and aggravating for any factors.

All council members agreed that a two letter grade reduction was appropriate. Each problem set was worth 4% of the total grade and three problem sets were found in violation, thus 12% of the grade, which on the CPS is worth a two letter grade reduction.

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:	0
2 letter grade reduction:	6
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 two letter grade reduction. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to his record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 30 minutes

Respectfully submitted,

Allison Salter

Clerk