

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 11, Fall 2014
December 3rd, 2014

Members Present:

Hurst Williamson (presiding), Claire Bonnyman (clerk), Helen Sharpless, Sarah Frazier, Shayak Sengupta, Alex Metcalf, Shantan Chemeerla, Kristin Sweeney, Michael Jin

Ombuds: Jayme Smith

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of trying to gain an unfair advantage for an upper level STAT course.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Student B's written statement
- Student A's Revised Written Statement
- Gradebook File #1
- Gradebook File #2
- Gradebook Log
- Student A's Midterm 1
- Student A's Midterm 2
- Course Syllabus

Plea:

Student A pled "in violation."

Student B pled "not in violation."

Testimony:

In his opening statement Student A stated that he was in violation and presented a new written statement. According to Student A, he borrowed Student B's computer to do an assignment for a job interview and during the time that he borrowed Student B's computer, realized that Student B was a grader for his class and changed his grades using Student B's OwlSpace account.

In his opening statement Student B did not know why he was involved in the violation. He said that he had only lent his computer to Student A in order for Student A to complete a job interview assignment and that Student A later returned the laptop. After looking back through his OwlSpace history, Student B found that Student A had been borrowing the computer during the time the changes were made.

In Student A's closing statement, Student A said that he was regretful that the violation occurred and that he violated the trust of Student B.

In his closing statement Student B said that he was not in violation of the Honor Code and believed that Student A used Student B's OwlSpace account to change his grades.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because of Student A's testimony and the overwhelming evidence submitted by the professor that showed that the grades had indeed been changed on the night Student A was in possession of Student B's laptop.

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

Yes: 9
No: 0
Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A committed the violation. No one saw anything to the contrary.

Straw Poll #2: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student A is "In Violation?"

Yes: 9
No: 0
Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student B committed the violation. The Council members agreed that Student B was responsible for safeguarding his OwlSpace account, however the Council believed that Student A's actions went outside Student B's ability to protect his personal accounts and that Student B's trust was taken advantage of.

Straw Poll #3: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student B is "In Violation?"

Yes: 0
No: 9
Abstentions: 0

Penalty Deliberations:

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. Some Council members discussed mitigation for cooperation but after discussion it was agreed upon that while Student A did the "right thing" in confessing during his hearing, his previous attempt to mislead the Council with a false written statement during his investigation canceled out any mitigation for cooperation.

The Council members then discussed aggravating factors. All Council members aggravated for deceit of the Council, attempting to conceal a violation, and potential harm of another student. They also discussed whether the violation was a heinous

violation. Since Student A seriously endangered Student B's academic reputation, integrity, and future, and had already caused him to lose his job as a grader, the Council decided that the violation was indeed heinous.

Straw Poll #4: Is Student A's violation a heinous violation?

Yes:	9
No:	0
Abstentions:	0

A unanimous vote of a heinous violation allowed the Council to exceed its normal penalty structure. The Council unanimously agreed that the weight of aggravating factors present in the case, particularly the endangerment and harm caused to Student B, warranted removal from the university. Suspension was discussed, however it was unanimously agreed that the Council assigns suspension only as a rehabilitative manner. In this case, the Council unanimously agreed that the aggravating factors along with a unanimous vote as a heinous violation meant that there should not be any rehabilitative aspects to Student A's punishment.

Straw Poll #6: What is the appropriate penalty for Student A?

Expulsion:	9
F in the course and 3 semesters of suspension:	0
Abstentions:	0

Decision:

The Honor Council thus finds Student A "In Violation" of the Honor Code and recommends expulsion. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to his record.

The Honor Council thus find Student B "Not In Violation" of the Honor Code.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 45 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
 Claire Bonnyman
 Clerk