

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 17-3, Fall 2023
02/03/2024

Members Present:

Pedro Ribeiro (presiding), Dean Toumajian (clerk), Olivia Thom, Gerald Lu, Sriya Kakarla, Naidhruv Ananth-lyer

Ombuds: Phillip Seo

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of using unauthorized aid on an in-person, online quiz for a lower level EMT course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Event Log
- Course Syllabus
- Quiz Final Exam
- Student Submitted Evidence
 - Canvas Security Information
 - Alternative Grades
 - Student A's Grades
 - Canvas Quiz Logs Examples
 - Canvas Quiz Log Validity

Plea:

Student A pled "NOT IN VIOLATION"

Testimony:

The student discussed what might have caused their quiz logs to misrepresent their actions. The student recognizes they left the testing area under the assumption that they had already submitted the exam. Once they got to a secondary location (the library) they realized they had not submitted the assignment, and with some clarity of mind they changed some answers. However, maintains they did not use unauthorized aid. They also explained that their final grade even with a low grade on the accused assignment would have left them with an A in the course (*i.e.*, there was no incentive for them to cheat).

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the student admitted to leaving the room while the exam/quiz

was being administered. The council was unable to come to a conclusion about whether unauthorized aid was used during the exam (*i.e.*, canvas logs seemed inconclusive).

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. Which the student admitted to leaving the room which is a violation on their part.

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. There were no clear mitigating factors. The council considered whether a substantial percentage of the assignment was unaffected by the violation. The council concluded that even though only a few questions were changed, the entire exam could have been apart of the violation. One council member argued for substantial disclosure, but the rest of the council was unconvinced. The council then discussed and found no aggravating factors present.

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

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

F in the course 0
3 letter grade reduction: 5
2 letter grade reduction: 1
1 letter grade reduction: 0
Letter of Reprimand 0
Abstentions: 0

The CPS severity starts at a baseline of severity level 2.

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

Expulsion: 0
Suspension: 0
Reprimand: 5
Warning: 1
Abstentions: 0

There was a very long discussion on whether the severity ought to be a warning or a reprimand. The council found that the violation was not “technical”, and some held that the violation went against the “spirit of the honor code.” One honor council member held that the violation was not so severe, but the council disagreed.

Decision:

The Honor Council thus finds Student A “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that they receive 3 letter grade reduction and a reprimand.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 02 Hours and 5 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Dean Toumajian
Clerk