

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 65-4, Spring 2016
September 8, 2016

Members Present:

Katie Jensen (presiding), Alex Metcalf (clerk), Haihao Liu, Ike Arjmand, Reece Rosenthal, Ellen Diemert, Peter Rizzi (observing), Richard Bui (observing)

Ombuds: Kenton Whitmire

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of accessing unauthorized materials on a homework assignment 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
- Student Problem Set
- Problem Set Answer Key
- Professor Clarification
- Syllabus
- Textbook
- Course Powerpoints

Plea:

Student A pled "in violation."

Testimony:

Student A stated that he looked online for solutions. He located a copy of the online solutions and presented these solutions as his own.

For his closing statement, Student A reiterated his responsibility for committing the violation and stated he understood that his actions are in violation.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the student stated he committed a violation.

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

Yes: 6+2 observing

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

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

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

Yes: 6+2 observing

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

Penalty Deliberations:

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. Some Council members saw no mitigating factors, while others considered mitigating for the amount of the assignment demonstrably not in violation – though further discussion indicated that there was not a firm demonstration that the rest of the assignment was not in violation. Ultimately, no Council member felt that mitigation away from a punitive aspect was appropriate, and the Council unanimously decided upon a 1 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: 0

1 letter grade reduction: 6+2 observing

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 one letter grade reduction.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 20 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Alex Metcalf
Clerk