

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case #49, Fall 2015
October 8, 2015

Members Present:

Alex Metcalf (presiding), Emilia Duno (clerk), Reece Rosenthal, Jacob Schneckloth, Nick Conard, Clark Zha, Lanie Tubbs, Meghana Pannala

Ombuds: Lawrence Cimino

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of altering an exam prior to a re-grade for a lower level CHEM 122 course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Syllabus
- Re-graded Exam
- Original Exam
- Exam Comparison

Plea:

Student A pled "Not in Violation".

Testimony:

In her opening statement Student A claimed that after receiving the exam she took notes of what she missed points on but in the midst of that time she had a lot of things going on and was under a lot of stress so when she was taking notes she forgot that she had modified it. Later, when she was studying, she saw the problem that might have been right and she decided to ask for points back as she had forgotten that she had made a change.

A Council member then asked how long it was between when she got the exam back after it was graded and when she submitted it for a re-grade. Student A replied that it had been about a week or two. Another council member then asked how long would it generally took to have exams regraded to which Student A replied two or three days.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because Student A modified the exam before submitting it for a regrade.

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. The Council decided that due to the fact that an exam was turned in changed for a regrade that a violation had clearly occurred.

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

Yes: 9

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

Penalty Deliberations:

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. The council decided that due to the small amount of points that she attempted to change on the exam that they would be willing to mitigate for the amount of the assignment in question.

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: 0

1 letter grade reduction: 1

2/3 letter grade reduction: 0

1/3 letter grade reduction: 0

Letter of Reprimand: 8

Abstentions: 0

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: 0

1 letter grade reduction: 0

2/3 letter grade reduction: 0

1/3 letter grade reduction: 0

Letter of Reprimand: 9

Abstentions: 0

Decision:

The Honor Council thus finds Student A “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that she receive a letter of violation. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to her record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 35 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Emilia Duno
Clerk