

**Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 6, Fall 2017
December 4, 2017**

Members Present:

Reece Rosenthal (presiding), Stefano Romano (clerk), Hector Chaires, Haihao Liu, Maheen Khizar, Peter Rizzi

Ombuds: Carey Wang

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of falsifying a re-grade 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
- Course syllabus
- Student A's re-grade request
- Student A's exam
- Exam key
- Professor clarification
- Re-grade request rules
- TA clarification
- Screenshots of Student A's text conversations

Plea:

Student A pled "Not In Violation."

Testimony:

Student A started by stating that everything that the professor stated is true. The student altered her exam originally in an attempt to earn more credit on the exam dishonestly. However, the student stated that she herself did not turn in the re-grade request, and did not intend to turn in the re-grade request. Student A then stated that she did not turn in the re-grade request, and that someone else must have turned in the re-grade request against the will of the student.

Student A closed by restating the sequence of events from her opening statement, and by reiterating that while she did alter a re-grade request, she never attempted or intended to turn in the falsified re-grade request.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because there was a lack of material evidence to support the student's testimony that she did not turn in the re-grade request. Additionally, some Council

members stipulated that signing the Honor Code pledge on the re-grade request in and of itself is an Honor Code violation as well.

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. The Council saw no reason as to why Student A did not commit 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 and aggravating circumstances. The Council saw no reason to mitigate or aggravate the penalty for the violation.

The CPS penalty for this case, based on the weight of the assignment, is a 3 letter grade reduction in both the lecture grade as well as the separate lab grade, as the exam was worth 16% of both course grades.

Vote #3: What is the appropriate penalty for Student A?

F in both courses: 0

3 letter grade reduction in both courses: 6

2 letter grade reduction in both courses: 0

1 letter grade reduction in both courses: 0

Letter of Reprimand 0

Abstentions: 0

Decision:

The Honor Council thus finds Student A “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that she receive a 3 letter grade reduction in both the lecture and lab courses.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 1 hour, 15 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Stefano Romano
Clerk