

**Abstract of the Honor Council  
Case 43F, Fall 2010  
September 1, 2010**

**Members Present:**

Hillary Baker-Jennings (presiding), Travis Smith (clerk), Trey Burns, David French, Adam Hartman, Lindsay Kirton, Gabriela Lopez, Sean Sessel, Jeff Worne

**Ombuds:** Darren Li

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of using an unauthorized resource on a pledged problem in a lower-level science course.

**Evidence Submitted:**

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Course Syllabus
- Pledge Problem #10 w/ Official Solution
- Solution posted on Cramster by Professor
- Student A's Pledge Problem #10 (copy and original)

**Plea:**

Student A pled "in violation."

**Testimony:**

The accused student said they did not know who the original poster to Cramster was, but that he is still in violation. He looked at the pledge problem and did not know the relevant sections of the book because he had not attended class. He used a search engine to find relevant portions of the problem. The student found the exact problem on the Internet and used it to guide his problem solving, making a few changes. He does not remember exactly what he changed, but he did use the Internet for the two problems in question. He used the Internet source for about ninety minutes. He had not been aware of the existence of the site Cramster before finding this, nor does he know if any other students used it.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that there was clear and convincing evidence that a violation occurred because of the material evidence provided by the professor, and the student's testimony.

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 student's testimony, Council members believed that Student A had 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.

Every member noted that the student was very cooperative because he admitted to using the Internet. Members also mitigated nature of the violation because the assignment was such a small portion of the grade. A member who chose to not mitigate because of the weight of the assignment instead decided to mitigate for consistency with related Council rulings.

No member found aggravating circumstances.

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

F in the course: 2  
3 letter grade reduction: 3  
2 letter grade reduction: 4  
1 letter grade reduction: 0  
Letter of Reprimand: 0  
Abstentions: 0

A member brought up the possibility of aggravating for premeditation, but the Council found that not relevant. Some Council members noted that the student said he had used the internet for all parts of the problem, but Council members decided they could not determine specifically how much of the assignment the student had used unauthorized sources on. Some members took his answer to be sufficient evidence, but other did not. Some members cited previous similar cases, and urged Council members to consider those penalties for the sake of consistency.

Straw Poll #4: What is the appropriate penalty for Student A?

F in the course: 2  
3 letter grade reduction: 1  
2 letter grade reduction: 6  
1 letter grade reduction: 0  
Letter of Reprimand: 0  
Abstentions: 0

Straw Poll #4 made binding.

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

Time of testimony and deliberations: 39 minutes

Respectfully submitted,  
Travis Smith  
Clerk