

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 59-1, Spring 2016
September 15, 2016

Members Present:

Katie Jensen (presiding), Natalie Swanson (clerk), Peter Rizzi, Hector Chaires, Angel Garces, Jacob Kesten, Ryan Carlson (observing), Stefano Romano (observing)

Ombuds: Colin Losey

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of receiving unauthorized aid on a final exam for a lower level EMSP course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Exam Event Log
- Assessment Summary
- Final Exam Instructions
- IT Clarification
- Owlspace Log
- Syllabus
- Student A's screenshots

Plea:

Student A pled "not in violation."

Testimony:

Student A started by reviewing the accusation: he said that a violation would entail working, a lapse in time, more work, and a submission, whereas a non-violation would entail working, a lapse in time, and submission.

The accused student stated that he worked on the exam without being able to go back on earlier questions due to restrictions on Owlspace. He estimated that it took 3 to 4 hours to complete. He said that he closed out of the browser, but did not submit the assessment because he did not realize the submit button was on the next page. He revisited the class page to review answers to see how he had done and noticed that he had not submitted the exam after completing it, so he submitted it at 3:13 a.m.

Student A then brought in a witness, who was sworn in. The witness answered questions asked by the accused student. The witness provided character testimony that could not be considered by the council.

Student A brought in a second witness, who was sworn in. The witness answered questions asked by the accused student. The witness provided character testimony that could not be considered by the council.

Student A closed by summarizing the case and saying that he did not work on the exam in more than one sitting. He had forgotten to submit the exam and the following evening he submitted the exam without continuing to work on it.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because there was not enough evidence to prove that Student A had worked on his assessment a second time.

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

Yes: 0

No: 6 +2 observing

Abstentions: 0

Decision:

The Honor Council thus finds Student A “Not In Violation” of the Honor Code.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 40 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Natalie Swanson
Clerk