

Abstract of the Honor Council

Case 11, Fall 2017

Members Present:

Reece Rosenthal (presiding), Maheen Khizar (clerk), Grant Wilkinson, Rohit Chouhan, Stefano Romano, Haihao Liu

Ombuds: Laura Li

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of submitting an altered exam regrade request for a lower level CHEM course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Canvas Announcement of Exam 3 Regrade Request
- Examination Key
- Student A's original exam
- Student A's regrade request
- Course updated syllabus
- Witness testimony for Student A's health

Plea:

Student A pled "in violation."

Testimony:

Student A stated that the alterations were notes he put down on the side of his regrade request, not realizing that he had done so upon submission. He provided notes verifying that he was diagnosed with influenza during the relevant timeframe. Upon questioning from a council member as to the timeline, he stated his notes were sourced from the exam's released answer key a week before submitting. He stated the altered submission was a honest mistake.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the student's re-grade request violated the syllabus policy.

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.

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.

A council member put forth that not all questions were altered on the re-grade request, so warranting discussion of mitigation. Another council member brought into discussion a relevant section of the syllabus, which states that a re-grade request brings the entire exam into consideration. Chair pointed out that a significant portion of exam questions were requested for re-grade consideration. Discussion of mitigating and aggravating circumstances concluded with no council members calling for mitigation or aggravation.

The CPS penalty for this case, based on the weight of the assignment, is a 3 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: 6

2 letter grade reduction: 0

1 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 3 letter grade reduction.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 30 minutes

Respectfully submitted,

Maheen Khizar

Clerk