

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 14, Fall 2016
January 29, 2017

Members Present:

Katie Jensen (presiding), Stefano Romano (clerk), Jake Reinhart, Ike Arjmand, Claire Bonnyman, Alex Metcalf

Ombuds: Matt Nobles

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Students A and B of unauthorized collaboration on an exam for an upper level mechanical engineering course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Student B's written statement
- Student A and B's exams
- Selected sample exams
- Course syllabus
- Student A's notes
- Student A's travel records

Plea:

Student A pled "Not In Violation."

Student B pled "In Violation."

Testimony:

Student A started by stating that she gave her take-home exam to Student B to turn in, as Student A had a trip during the exam period, and because she would be returning the day of the exam due date, Student A did not want to run the risk of having a delayed flight and not being able to turn in her exam. Student A then demonstrated from her notes how she solved certain problems on the exam. Student A also mentioned that she used her notes to complete certain problems, as was allowed on the take-home exam. Student A stated that she did not discuss any of the exam problems with Student B.

Student B stated that she copied certain portions of the exam from Student A when she received Student A's exam to turn in. Student B also showed using her notes how her answers on some parts of the exam were found. Student B stated that she did not discuss any of the problems with Student A. Student B also stated that she copied Student A's exam without Student A's knowledge.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because of Student B's testimony and the similarity between the two exams.

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

Yes: 6
 No: 0
 Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A committed the violation. The Council decided that Student A did not know a violation had occurred, and had not committed a violation. The Council then discussed whether or not Student B committed the violation. The Council saw no reason otherwise.

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

Yes: 0
 No: 6
 Abstentions: 0

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

Yes: 6
 No: 0
 Abstentions: 0

Penalty Deliberations:

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. Council members mitigated for the amount of assignment demonstrably not in violation. Some council members also decided to mitigate for substantial disclosure to the Council. Council members decided to aggravate for Student B's theft of Student A's work.

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

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: 1
 3 letter grade reduction: 5
 2 letter grade reduction: 0
 1 letter grade reduction: 0
 Letter of Reprimand: 0
 Abstentions: 0

Decision:

The Honor Council thus finds Student A "Not In Violation" of the Honor Code. The Honor Council thus finds Student B "In Violation" of the Honor Code and recommends

that she receive a 3 letter grade reduction. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to Student B's record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 35 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Stefano Romano
Clerk