

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 2, Fall 2023
11/27/2023

Members Present:

Pedro Ribeiro (presiding), Dean Toumajian (clerk), Todd Hao, Riya Yarlagadda, Olivia Thom, James Cheng

Ombuds: Saif Ganni

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of submitting an in-class attendance assignment without being present in the class for a lower level EEPS course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
 - Original email of contact with Honor Council
- Student A's written statement
- Email correspondence with the Professor clarifying the assignment
- Assignment Prompt
- In-class activity instructions
- Course syllabus
- Student A's assignment response
- Other student assignment response

Plea:

Student A pled "NOT IN VIOLATION."

Testimony:

The student was not in class, and while outside class they submitted the assignment under the wrong pretense. They understood the assignment to be asking for them to name a classmate they would like to work with for another assignment (*i.e.*, picking partners). A friend sent them the link to the assignment to the accused student. The student was stuck in traffic during this time and was unable to make it back to class. The student owned up to having done what they was accused of, but argued that this should not be an honor council case.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the assignment was an "in-class activity" that was done outside the classroom, which was not permitted by the professor.

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 Honor Council found that Student A committed the violation, because they admitted to doing and submitting the assignment outside of the class.

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 discussed whether the case should be adjudicated as the weight of the aggregate of the assignments (30% as ascribed by the syllabus) or as the individual assignments weight ~1%. One council member argued that it should be seen as a 30% assignment that is mitigated down because it is a proportion of the grade. The other members were not moved by this argument. The council then concluded that the assignment weight should be considered to be ~1%. According to the CPS the penalty would be a 1 letter grade reduction. The Council saw no aggravating factors.

The CPS penalty for this case, based on the weight of the assignment, is a 1 letter grade reduction

Vote #3: What is the appropriate penalty for Student A?
 F in the course 0
 3 letter grade reduction: 0
 2 letter grade reduction: 0
 1 letter grade reduction: 4
 Letter of Reprimand 2
 Abstentions: 0

The CPS severity starts at a baseline of severity level 2. The council agreed that the baseline severity fit the case, for there was no mitigating or aggravating factors.

Vote #4: What is the appropriate severity level for Student A?

Expulsion: 0
 Suspension: 0
 Reprimand: 6
 Warning: 0
 Abstentions: 0

Decision:

The Honor Council thus finds Student A “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that they receive a 1 letter grade reduction and a reprimand.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 01:04:00

Respectfully submitted,
Dean Toumajian
Clerk