

**Abstract of the Honor Council**  
**Case 11, Fall 2018**  
**4/24/19**

**Members Present:**

Matt Nobles (presiding), Caroline Brehm (clerk), Sean Olsen, Angela Liu, Matey Yanakiev, James Suffoletta

**Ombuds:** Jean Choi

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of using unauthorized aid during an exam 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
- Student A's final exam
- Class syllabus
- Previous exam key
- Previous final exam key
- Canvas access report
- Canvas post

**Plea:**

Student A pled "in violation."

**Testimony:**

Student A opened by stating that he was very sorry for what he did and understood that he committed a violation. He did access previous exam keys during the time that he was taking his exam. However, he did not feel his violation was as serious as was portrayed in the Letter of Accusation. There were two mitigating factors. First, by pleading "in violation," he exhibited substantial disclosure. Second, a significant portion of his exam was not in violation. He lost points on exam questions that were the same as questions included in the previous exam keys. Thus, he did not copy the exam key directly; he only checked to confirm that they were the same questions that he had previously studied. The exam consisted of his own work.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because both Student A's testimony and the Canvas access report supported that the student received unauthorized aid on the exam.

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 found no reason that Student A would not be not in 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. The Council did not believe that the student exhibited substantial disclosure because the Council would have come to the same conclusion based on the Canvas access report, Student A’s exam, and the previous exam keys. There was also no hard evidence to suggest that most of the exam was demonstrably not in violation, so the Council ultimately found no mitigating factors. The Council also found no aggravating factors.

The CPS penalty for this case, based on the weight of the assignment, is an F in the course and 1 semester suspension.

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: 6

F in the course: 0

3 letter grade reduction: 0

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 an F in the course and 1 semester suspension.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 1 hour

Respectfully submitted,  
Caroline Brehm  
Clerk