

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 26, Spring 2017
March 29, 2017

Members Present:

Katie Jensen (presiding), Stefano Romano (clerk), Allie Salter, Grant Wilkinson, Ryan Carlson, Ellen Diemert, Grace Coleman (observing), Franz Brotzen (observing)

Ombuds: Sam Morimoto

Letter of Accusation:

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

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Student A's exam
- Course syllabus
- Witness statement
- Exam study guide
- Exam review
- Exam Owl-Space announcement
- Lecture notes
- Selected online and print articles

Plea:

Student A pled "Not In Violation."

Testimony:

Student A opened by stating that she did not violate the honor code on this exam. Similarities between the exam and outside resources were due to thorough studying prior to the exam. The student made a study guide from Internet articles and lecture notes that focused on topics given at the professor's review session. Student A stated that she memorized the entirety of these two pages of notes before the exam because she did not feel comfortable coming up with definitions in her own words as English is not her first language. Because of this, she used definitions from memory on her exam. Student A stated that she had asked a professor in a previous course if such regurgitation from memory was allowed on exams, and he had permitted it, but she clarified that she had not had a similar conversation with the professor of this course. Student A then reasserted that she studied thoroughly for the exam, and took the exam without any unauthorized aid.

Student A closed by stating that she attended class every day, studied for the exam thoroughly, and used memorization techniques to prepare for the exam. She stated that she followed the Honor Code, and did not commit an Honor Code violation.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence did not support that a violation occurred because the student's study materials and the student's exam were similar, and supported the student's testimony that she memorized her study guide for her exam.

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

Yes: 1 + 1 observing

No: 5 + 1 observing

Abstentions: 0

Decision:

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

Time of testimony and deliberations: 50 minutes

Respectfully submitted,

Stefano Romano

Clerk