

Abstract of the Honor Council**Case 7, Fall 2016****Dec 4, 2016****Members Present:**

Reece Rosenthal (presiding), Jacob Kesten (clerk), Claire Bonnyman, Richard Bui, Dessy Akinfenwa, Angel Garces

Ombuds: Colin Losey**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of modifying a regrade request for a upper level biochemistry course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Lecture Slides
- Original Exam in Full
- Original Exam – page in question
- Regrade Exam in Full
- Regrade Exam – page in question
- Regrade Instructions
- Regrade Request
- Course Syllabus
- TA Statement
- Exam Key

Plea:

Student A pled “not in violation.”

Testimony:

Student A stated that he did not look at anyone else’s test. He stated that he did not change his exam before submitting the regrade request.

He argued, however, that even if he had altered his regrade request that would not be a violation of the Honor Code because regrade request alterations do not qualify as any major violation described in the Honor Council website. Furthermore, the course syllabus does not explicitly forbid altering regrade requests before submitting them for additional points. Thus, Student A concluded that no language in either the Honor Council website or the course syllabus would indicate that a violation had occurred.

Student A maintained that he did not alter his regrade request. He wanted points back for drawings on the exam, not any writing (original or changed).

Student A believed that exams could be altered before submitting them for a regrade request as long as the changes were not used to get points back. He also stated the professor never said students couldn't alter an exam before submitting it for a regrade request.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because Student A altered a regrade request which is a violation of the Honor Code.

All Council members believed a violation had occurred.

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. Because Student A altered the regrade request, the Council determined that he committed the violation.

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. Council members decided to mitigate for amount of the assignment in violation, as only a small portion of the exam had been altered in the regrade request.

The Council did not consider any aggravating factors.

Given the weight percent of the exam in the overall course grade, Council members mitigated down to a one 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
 2/3 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.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 30 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Jacob Kesten
Clerk