

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 27, Spring 2017
March 7, 2017

Members Present:

Katie Jensen (presiding), Stefano Romano (clerk), Andy Lu, Alex Metcalf, Dessy Akinfenwa, Joanne Kim

Ombuds: Laura Li

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of receiving unauthorized aid on an 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
- Student A's notes
- Screenshot of Student A's submission time
- Screenshot of Owl-Space announcement regarding the exam
- Screenshot of Student A's search history
- Student A's study guide for exam
- Course syllabus
- Selected online articles

Plea:

Student A pled "Not In Violation."

Testimony:

Student A opened by stating that he used the online articles and resources his exam bore a similarity to before the exam to study, but did not use any resources as he was taking the exam. Student A stated that he did not use his notes during the exam, but that the similarity between his exam and the online articles was from rote memorization from his notes. Student A then went on to say that no one was in the room when he was taking the exam, and that he had no outside help on the exam. Student A closed by stating that he did not have any access to unauthorized aid during the exam, and only used the mentioned online resources to study prior to the exam.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because there were strong similarities between the exam and the selected resources. Additionally, some of these similarities could not be found in the student's study guide or notes. The Council also discussed the angle that by copying paragraphs of material from the outside resources, the student committed plagiarism of

those sources. The Council ultimately concluded that a Student A committed a violation by accessing unauthorized resources during a take home exam.

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 saw no reason to indicate otherwise.

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

Yes: 6

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

Penalty Deliberations:

Council members opened by discussing mitigating and aggravating circumstances. The Council saw no mitigating factors, nor aggravating factors.

The CPS penalty for this case, based on the weight of the assignment, is an F in the course. Thus, the Council decided an F in the course is the appropriate penalty for the violation.

Vote #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: 6

3 letter grade reduction: 0

2 letter grade reduction: 0

1 letter grade reduction: 0

Letter of Reprimand 0

Abstentions: 0

Decision:

The Honor Council thus finds Student A “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that he receive an F in the course. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to his record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 30 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Stefano Romano
Clerk