

**\*\*\*\*PLEASE NOTE:\*\*\*\***

**-HE/HIS FOR ODD NUMBERED CASES**

**-SHE/HER FOR EVEN NUMBERED CASES**

**Abstract of the Honor Council**

**Case #43a, Spring 2010**

**August 28, 2010**

**Members Present:**

Hilary Baker-Jennings (presiding), Melissa Fwu (clerk), Trey Burns, Matthew Diasio, David French, Adam Hartman, Erin O'Brian, Keenan May, Lemuel Soh

**Ombuds:** Eric Li

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of using unauthorized aid on a pledge problem for a lower level science course.

**Evidence Submitted:**

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Course Syllabus
- Pledge Problem #10 with official solution
- Solution posted to Cramster by Professor
- Student A's Pledge Problem #10
- Professor Deposition
- Student A's Pledge Problem #10 (Original)

**Plea:**

Student A pled "in violation."

**Testimony:**

Student A stated that while doing Pledge Problem Set #10, he was having problems figuring out the first problem and was getting frustrated. Instead of just giving up and taking the point deduction, the student looked up the problem on Google. The Google search engine led him to the Cramster post with the "distinctly wrong" solution that the accuser had posted. The post by the accuser was in response to another post which had asked the Cramster community for help on the same problem as Question #1 of Pledge Problem #10. Student A claims he is not the original poster but did make the mistake of using the accuser's response post as a reference on Question #1 to help him answer the question. At the time, the student was not thinking of the fact that using Cramster was a violation and was not intending to break the honor code to get a better grade. Still, he did recognize how using Cramster as a resource was a violation of the Honor Code and thus plead in violation.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that there was clear and convincing evidence that a violation occurred based on the material evidence provided by the accuser and testimony given by Student A.

Straw Poll #1: Is there clear and convincing evidence that a violation occurred?

Yes: 9  
No: 0  
Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A committed the violation.

Based on the testimony of Student A, the council agreed that Student A committed the violation.

Straw Poll #2: Is there clear and convincing evidence that Student A is “In Violation?”

Yes: 9  
No: 0  
Abstentions: 0

Straw Polls #1 and #2 made binding.

**Penalty Deliberations:**

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances.

Council members mitigated on level of cooperation and nature of the violation. The Council agreed that the student was fully cooperative and answered all the questions of the Council. As for nature of the violation, since the entire Problem Set #10 was only 2% of the final grade, the Council agreed that mitigation on nature was appropriate.

The Council found no reason to aggravate.

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

The abstaining member was deciding between a 1 and 2 letter grade reduction. Council members who believed a 2 letter grade reduction was necessary mitigated 2 steps for

cooperation and 2 steps for nature. Members voting for a 1 letter grade reduction mitigated one step more for either cooperation or nature.

Straw Poll #4: 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:	8
1 letter grade reduction:	1
Letter of Reprimand:	0
Abstentions:	0

Members who changed their votes felt that they may have perhaps mitigated too much for either cooperation or nature. A Council member felt that additional mitigation on the nature of the violation was appropriate, thus voting for a 1 letter grade reduction.

Straw Poll #4 made binding.

The Honor Council thus finds Student A “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that he receive a 2 letter grade reduction. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to his record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 17 minutes

Respectfully submitted,  
Melissa Fwu  
Clerk