

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 22, Spring 2019
4/28/19

Members Present:

Sam Holloway (presiding), James Suffoletta (clerk), Sree Yeluri, Sanat Mehta, Rapha Onyeka, Matey Yanakiev

Ombuds: Michael Katona

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Students A, B, and C of unauthorized collaboration on three assignments for an upper level SMGT 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
- Student C's written statement
- Course syllabus
- Three assignments in question (questions and answers)
- Assignment instructions
- Grade weight clarification
- Random student samples

Plea:

Student A pled "not in violation."

Student B pled "not in violation."

Student C pled "not in violation."

Testimony:

Student A stated that she did not collaborate with the other students on the quizzes. Most of the questions on the quizzes are definition questions, and the answers to these questions look similar because there was a video explaining them for the course. She watched the lecture videos before taking the quizzes, and the definitions were in the videos. She did study together with one of the other students, but she did not know Student B was in the class. Student A answered the questions briefly and did not elaborate too much in the answers to the quiz questions.

Student B stated that for all three assignments she was accused for, she was at home and could not have given or received unauthorized aid. She emphasized that she did not know Student A was in the class, and that she did not collaborate with her. She watched the lecture videos before the quiz and tried to memorize the material from the videos before taking the quiz. Student B added that the definitions she gave in the quizzes were very

similar to the ones given in the video. She also stated that she did study together with Student C before other quizzes, but not for the three assignments in question. Student C stated that she took all of the assignments by herself, and that she got all of the definitions from the videos posted before the quizzes. She studied with both Student A and B for these quizzes at times, and she made flashcards for some of the definitions on the quizzes. She studied the flashcards before the quizzes.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the student answers to the assignments were substantially similar, especially when compared to the random student samples.

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 why Student A would not be in violation.

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

Yes: 6
No: 0
Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student B committed the violation. The Council saw no reason why Student B would not be in violation.

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

Yes: 6
No: 0
Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student C committed the violation. The Council saw no reason why Student C would not be in violation.

Vote #4: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student C is “In Violation?”

Yes: 6
No: 0
Abstentions: 0

Penalty Deliberations:

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. For Student A, one of their three assignments was not in violation, and another was deemed to be in violation. The third was in violation, but since there was a substantial amount that was demonstrably not in violation, the Council decided to mitigate.

The CPS penalty for this case, based on the weight of the assignment, is a 2 letter grade reduction.

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
Letter of Reprimand	0
Abstentions:	0

For Students B and C, the Council also considered mitigating based on the amount of the assignment demonstrably not in violation. However, the Council ultimately believed that a substantial amount of the three assignments violated the Honor Code, and they decided not to mitigate.

The CPS penalty for this case, based on the weight of the assignment, is a 3 letter grade reduction.

Vote #6: What is the appropriate penalty for Student B?

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

Vote #7: What is the appropriate penalty for Student C?

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 Students A, B, and C “In Violation” of the Honor Code. The Honor Council recommends that Student A receive a 1 letter grade reduction, and that Students B and C receive a 3 letter grade reduction.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 1 hour, 27 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
James Suffoletta
Clerk