

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 3-1, Summer 2019
11/26/19

Members Present:

Amy Lin (presiding), James Suffoletta (clerk), Mark Cantu, Abrar Mamun, Grace Coleman, Izzie Karohl

Ombuds: Oeishi Banerjee

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of using unauthorized aid on an exam 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
- Question clarification
- Point clarification
- Three random student samples
- Student A's full exam

Plea:

Student A pled "not in violation."

Testimony:

Student A stated that he did not usually study from the provided class notes and videos, as they did not fit his learning style. Instead, while studying for the exam, he would identify the important terms discussed in the lecture videos provided by the professor, Google these terms, and write down their definitions. He claimed that he did not take any definitions from the Internet during the exam or look at any other forms of unauthorized aid.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation did not occur. Although the answers were similar to the online sources, the similarities were not substantial; they clearly were not directly copied. The Council believed that the similarities were likely caused by Student A studying the terms on the exam using online resources. In addition, Student A's answers were similar to the random sample exams, indicating that other students had similar answers to the definition questions.

Vote #1: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred?

Yes: 0

No: 6

Abstentions: 0

Decision:

The Honor Council thus finds Student A “Not In Violation” of the Honor Code.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 18 minutes

Respectfully submitted,

James Suffoletta

Clerk