

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 69, Spring 2016
September 3, 2016

Members Present:

Katie Jensen (presiding), Alex Metcalf (clerk), Sara Meadow, Natalie Swanson, Dessy Akinfenwa, Ike Arjmand

Ombuds: Aaron Shaw

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of giving and receiving unauthorized aid during a midterm exam for an upper level bioengineering 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 statement
- Exam 3 2014
- Exam 3 Key 2014
- Exam 2 2016
- Exam 3 Key 2016
- Exam Instructions
- Exam 3 – Student A
- Exam 3 – Student B
- Student A's Homework 9
- Student B's Homework 9
- Homework 9 Key
- Homework 9 Key Release Date
- Syllabus
- Student B's course notes

Plea:

Student A pled "not in violation".
Student B pled "not in violation".

Testimony:

Student A:

Student A stated that the exam question solution was based off of a previous homework solution. He noted that this was acceptable, since the exam honor code was open book, open note, open homework. He stated that he worked on this homework with another student, and that if any plagiarized material were evident in his answers, it was the result of the other student.

The student stated that he integrated last second solutions in his exam solutions and added more comments, since he did not have anyone to bounce ideas off of.

In his closing statement, Student A stated that the only thing he did was use his homework solution to solve the problem. The student reiterated that he did not acquire any unauthorized material.

Student B:

Student B stated that he made heavy use of the posted solutions to the homework question while working on the exam. The student stated he had access to the solutions through OwlSpace, and that he did not collaborate with the other accused student.

In his closing statement, Student B restated that he used the posted homework solutions, and did not work with any other student on the exam.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because Student A's testimony did not account for the very significant differences between his homework and his exam solution.

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. They believed there was a significant discrepancy between his homework and exam. Student B was found "not in violation," since the student's explanation was within the exam Honor Code.

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

Yes: 6
No: 0
Abstentions: 0

Vote #3: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student B is "In Violation?"

Yes: 0
No: 6
Abstentions: 0

Penalty Deliberations:

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. Some Council members felt that mitigation was justified for amount of assignment in violation, and the Council decided that a one letter grade reduction was appropriate.

Vote #5: 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
2/3 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. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to his record.

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

Time of testimony and deliberations: 55 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
 Alex Metcalf
 Clerk