Honor Council Application 2020-2021

Undergraduate Honor Council

2020-2021 Application

Vanderbilt University students pursue all academic endeavors with integrity. They conduct themselves honorably, professionally, and respectfully in all realms of their studies in order to promote and secure an atmosphere of dignity and trust. The keystone of the honor system is self-regulation, which requires cooperation and support from each member of the University community.

Instructions and Overview

This application must be submitted by Friday, December 4, 2020 by 11:59pm. All final answers should be submitted via this Anchor Link form. Paper or email submissions will not be accepted. Please limit all answers to the space provided. E-mail honor.council@vanderbilt.edu with any questions. A copy of the application is available here (https://documentcloud.adobe.com/link/track?uri=urn%3Aaid%3Ascds%3AUS%3Ac41e83b7-162d-49c6-a426-bda90a26ad9e). .pdf format should you wish to prepare your responses offline; the final submission is done through this Anchorlink application.

Overview of selection procedures:

Potential Council members submit applications to be reviewed by the Executive Board. Outstanding candidates will be contacted in January for an interview with current members of the Honor Council. Finally, qualifying candidates will be placed on a ballot for election by members of their respective college. If elected, new Undergraduate Honor Council members will then be required to attend UHC Training scheduled for Sunday, February 14, 2021 at 9am.

*There is a minimum GPA of 2.5 to join the Honor Council. Furthermore, members of the Honor Council must maintain a 2.5 cumulative GPA to remain in good standing.

Personal Information

* Name


* VUnet ID


* Student ID # (Located on your YES Account Page. Example: 000XXXXX)
* Vanderbilt Email


* Cell Phone Number


* School

  - Arts and Science
  - Peabody
  - Engineering
  - Blair

* Major(s)

Minor(s)

* Class of

  - 2022
  - 2023
  - 2024

* Hometown (City, State/Country)

* Are you an international student or a transfer student?

  - Yes, I am an international student
  - Yes, I am a transfer student
Yes, I am both an international student and a transfer student
No, I am not an international student or transfer student

* T-Shirt Size

○ S
○ M
○ L
○ XL
○ XXL
○ XXXL

* Please list any dietary restrictions you may have:

* How did you learn about the Undergraduate Honor Council? Please select any options that apply

☐ Interest meetings
☐ Campus posters
☐ Campus sidewalk stickers
☐ Campus banner
☐ Nomination
☐ Another student
☐ Another student on the Honor Council
☐ VUcept/VUcept/RA
☐ Anchorlink
☐ Social Media
☐ Other

* Required

☐ By checking this box, you acknowledge that the Office of Student Accountability will check your educational record including academic and disciplinary record to verify that you meet membership eligibility requirements.
1. What is your general understanding of the Honor Code and the Honor Council? Why do you think the Honor Council is important to the Vanderbilt community? (250 word limit)

2. Honor Council members serve as both panelists and peer advisers for accused students. Please explain why you believe you could effectively fulfill both roles. Please reference the Student Handbook for any clarification. (250 word limit)

* Please note that should you be placed on the ballot for election, your answer to this question will appear on the ballot next to your name.

3. Being objective and unbiased are critical aspects of being an Honor Council member. Provide an example of a time you had to be objective or unbiased in your own life. How did you handle that responsibility? Be sure to explain how this lesson would inform your role as an Honor Council member. (250 word limit)

Section B: Sample Case

1. Sample Case Overview
2. Honor Code Reference Materials

3. Meeting Reports
   1. Meeting Report with Morgan Scott (Teaching Assistant)
   2. Meeting Report with Professor Dale
   3. Meeting Report with Barrett Graham
   4. Meeting Report with Taylor Ayoub

Sample Case Overview

The case included in this section of the application details a standard but fictional investigative report, typical of what panel members may encounter during a hearing. Two students have been called into the Office of Student Accountability, Community Standards, and Academic Integrity as part of an investigation for a potential Honor Code violation reported by the two students’ teaching assistant for their Strategic Management course. After initial investigative meetings, the Honor Council decides to proceed to a hearing with Barrett Graham as an accused student and Taylor Ayoub as a material witness. Before the hearing, Barrett Graham enters a plea of Not Guilty. Below, you will find helpful Honor Code reference materials and the meeting reports from the Honor Council’s investigation.

Honor Code Reference Materials

I. Determining Guilt or Non-Guilt:
   A. The Honor Council employs the preponderance standard to determine the guilt or non-guilt of an accused student. A preponderance of the evidence demands that it is more likely than not that a violation of the Honor Code occurred for an accused student to be found guilty of a violation. It is important to note that this standard is distinct from the “beyond reasonable doubt” standard that is employed in courts of law. Preponderance of the evidence is the standard employed by educational institutions across the country.

II. Questions
   A. Questions directed towards accused students and other witnesses should be clarifying and not accusatory in nature. In particular, refrain from asking leading questions. Rather, aim your questions towards clarifying gaps in the narrative that will directly inform your decision of the student’s guilt / non-guilt and your subsequent assessment of the ratings, a detailed description of which may be found in the section below.

III. Ratings
   A. If a student is found guilty of violating the Honor Code, the panel will then proceed into the ratings phase of deliberations in which the guilty student will be assessed in three categories: truthfulness, flagrancy, and premeditation.
      1. Truthfulness: How forthcoming and honest
has the student been from the time at which they were notified of the violation to now?
Are there clear gaps in the story? Is there a changing narrative of events?

2. **Flagrancy**: How bold was the violation? Does it call another student’s integrity into question? How much is the assignment in question worth? Was it an intentional violation?

3. **Premeditation**: Was the violation planned in advance? What steps did the student take to engage in the violation? What steps did the student take to cover up the violation?

---

**Meeting Reports**

**Meeting with Morgan Scott**

**November 7, 2020**

Morgan Scott is one of two teaching assistants for section 3 of MGRL-1101, Strategic Management for the Fall 2020 semester. The professor for MGRL-1101 is Professor Dale. There are 80 students in the class. The assignment in question is the third paper which is worth 10% of the final course grade. The paper assignment involved answering four questions related to the book *How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas* by C. Bornstein.

Morgan and the other course TA split the grading in half. For the third paper, Morgan graded 40 students’ papers.

Morgan noted that Barrett Graham submitted the assignment a week after the original paper deadline. Professor Dale had approved Barrett to turn in the paper late. Barrett turned in the paper via email. Morgan put Barrett’s paper on the top of the stack of papers to grade. The stack was in alphabetical order and Morgan had not begun grading any of the papers at the time. Professor Dale provides the TAs with a rubric for grading. One of the items on the rubric involves checking three quotes from the book included in the papers to verify that the student properly cited them. Morgan started the grading process by checking the formatting and checking for the three correctly cited quotes in each of the 40 papers.

Morgan started grading Barrett’s paper first. Morgan could not find the second quote included in Barrett’s paper in Bornstein’s book. Barrett’s citation for this particular quote said it was on page 44. Morgan could not find it on page 44 and, therefore, marked it wrong and continued grading. Since Taylor Ayoub is at the beginning of the alphabet, Morgan reviewed Taylor’s paper soon after Barrett’s paper. Morgan noticed that Taylor had included the same quote but had it cited to page 244. This citation was correct.

Morgan went back to Barrett’s paper to review the second quote. Morgan then closely read the text around the quotes in both papers and noticed a striking similarity between the two papers. Specifically, the first sentences of the second question were nearly identical. Morgan then proceeded to read the papers side by side and noticed that while some content had been moved in the papers, about 3/4 of Barrett’s paper had the same content and/or sentence structure as Taylor’s paper. Furthermore, all four quotes included in Barrett’s paper also appeared in Taylor’s paper. After copying the papers and underlining similar areas to compare content, Morgan reported the incident to Professor Dale. After reporting the incident to Professor Dale, Morgan referred the incident to the Undergraduate Honor Council.

---

**Meeting with Professor Dale**

**November 11, 2020**
Professor Dale teaches two sections of MGRL-1101, Strategic Management this semester (Fall 2020). There are approximately 80 students in each section. The final course grade is calculated based on points earned on 10 quizzes, 3 papers, a final group project, attendance, and participation.

The assignment in question is the third paper assignment. The paper is worth 10% of the final course grade. All of the paper assignments in the course require students to write a response no longer than 5 pages to provided questions related to a course reading. The third paper assignment required students to analyze and interact with the book entitled *How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas* by C. Bornstein. Students were instructed to respond to four questions related to the book. Students were asked to begin reading the book on October 10, 2020 as noted in the course syllabus. A hard copy of each student's paper was due October 24, 2020.

The student in question is Barrett Graham. Barrett is enrolled in section 3 of MGRL-1101. Professor Dale confirmed that Morgan Scott, a teaching assistant for section 3, noticed the similarities between Barrett Graham’s paper and Taylor Ayoub’s paper. Professor Dale instructed Morgan to submit an incident report to the Undergraduate Honor Council.

Professor Dale includes a section in the course syllabus about the Honor Code. Specifically, the syllabus states that all work in the course is governed by the Honor Code. The section goes on to say that students “are encouraged to have discussions with other students outside of class on assigned books, readings, case studies, and classroom discussions.” Professor Dale also said that cheating is addressed in class once or twice throughout the semester.

### Meeting with Taylor Ayoub

**November 15, 2020**

Taylor Ayoub started reading the book *How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas* by C. Bornstein several weeks before writing the third paper. Taylor began writing the paper a week or two before the paper deadline. Taylor often prints a few versions of a paper before completing the final draft for editing purposes. Taylor submitted the final version of the third paper in person on October 24, 2020 in the Managerial Studies office since class was not meeting that day.

Taylor said that Barrett Graham is a close friend. Barrett spends a lot of time at Taylor’s apartment studying and hanging out. Taylor confirmed that Barrett had asked about the formatting and/or length of the third paper for MGRL-1101. Taylor said that while they were talking about the paper format, Barrett reviewed a hard copy of Taylor’s draft to see the structural requirements of the assignment. Barrett then asked to keep the draft as a reference for formatting. Taylor agreed so long as Barrett agreed to use the paper for formatting purposes only.

After Taylor and Barrett received the notifications from the Honor Council about a reported violation, Barrett called Taylor and admitted to using the content of Taylor’s paper to complete his own paper.

### Meeting with Barrett Graham

**November 18, 2020**

Barrett Graham is a junior majoring in English and minoring in managerial studies. Barrett took MGRL-1101 because it is a requirement for other courses. Barrett was doing well in the course leading up to the third paper and had good attendance throughout the semester.

Barrett does not remember starting the book *How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas* by C. Bornstein. Barrett skimmed the book as was suggested by Professor Dale in the course syllabus. Barrett completed a rough draft of the third paper on October 23, 2020; however, Barrett had computer issues and lost the draft. Barrett alerted Professor Dale of the issue and was granted an extension. Barrett began working on a new draft of the paper in Taylor Ayoub’s suite. Barrett said that Taylor’s rough drafts of the third paper were lying around. Barrett and Taylor did discuss the paper but they only discussed the structure of the paper. Barrett asked to look at Taylor’s rough draft to use as a guide on formatting. Barrett initially only planned to review Taylor’s rough draft to see how the paper was supposed to be formatted, but ended up also using it to get quotes. Barrett noted that Taylor was in the suite during this time but said that Taylor didn’t know how Barrett was using his rough draft.
Barrett turned in the third paper in class on October 31, 2020. After reviewing the two papers in our meeting, Barrett acknowledged that the papers had some similarities. Barrett also suggested that some of the reason the papers were similar had to do with the fact that they were about the same book. Barrett denied using any of Taylor’s draft directly; rather, Barrett just used Taylor’s paper to identify important quotes and for formatting guidance.

Barrett was not very familiar with the Vanderbilt Honor System at the time of the incident. Barrett was aware that students were not permitted to receive aid on this assignment.

**Section B - Questions**

Please briefly answer the following questions:

* 1. What three questions would you ask the accused student, Barrett Graham? No explanation is necessary.

* 2. What three questions would you ask the material witness, Taylor Ayoub? No explanation is necessary.

After deliberation and based on the preponderance standard, the panel votes 6-0 to find Barrett Graham guilty of violating the Honor Code. Please refer to the “Ratings” section of the Honor Code Reference Materials to answer the following questions.

* 3. What three case facts do you think are important to consider when discussing the truthfulness with which the student has approached this Honor Council process? Describe why each is important. (150 word limit)

* 4. What three case facts do you think are important to consider when discussing the flagrancy of this violation? Describe why each is important. (150 word limit)
* 5. What three case facts do you think are important to consider when discussing the premeditation of this violation? Describe why each is important. (150 word limit)