Abstract discussion will be held on Wednesday (3/25) at 8:00PM in the MCC (Stokes).

**Lion King:**

**An Honor Council Academic Trial**

**Released Spring 2015**

This abstract was not released in accordance to the timeline specified by the Students’ Association Constitution. The confronting party consented to the release of the abstract. The confronted party consented to the release of the abstract. (The addition of this disclaimer began in Spring 2010).

**Note:** Some information has been lost due to the fact that the chair’s report for this case was not completed in a timely manner.

**Key:**
Confronted Party: Simba
Confronting Party: Mufasa
Professor: Rafiki
Involved Dean: Zazu

**Pre-Trial:**
Mufasa overheard Simba talking to other members from their [cub school] class about having started part of a take home exam one night and finishing it the next morning. Mufasa was concerned that Simba may have violated the Honor Code by taking extra time on the exam and confronted him. Honor Council sent the case to an academic trial.

**Fact Finding:**
The jury started fact finding by asking Simba a series of questions surrounding the incident. They asked him whether or not he did in fact take extra time on the exam. Simba conveyed that he had not taken extra time on the exam, but instead started the exam and then went to bed and completed the exam in the morning without going over the time limit. The jury told Simba that even if he was asleep and did not work on the exam over night, it still constituted as taking extra time. The jury then asked which questions Simba completed after waking up. Simba said he did parts of the last two questions which were the most difficult in the morning.
Statement of Violation:
The jury believes that Simba violated the Honor Code by not following instructions and taking extra-time on the take-home portion of the exam. (No record of how many jurors consented).

Circumstantial Portion:
The jury inquired as to why Simba took extra time on the exam. Simba told the jury that a personal matter at home had come up. Part-way through taking the exam he took a phone call from a family member and had to deal with some personal matters. This stress led Simba to stop working on the exam, go to bed, and then finish working on it in the morning.

The jury then asked Simba whether or not he felt as though he had obtained an unfair advantage. Simba said that he did not, seeing as he did not work on the exam for more than the allotted time.

Jury Deliberations:
There are no records of jury deliberations on the tentative or final resolutions.

Tentative Resolutions:
1) The jury recommends that [Simba] will receive either a 0.0 or a 1.0 on his exam, left to the discretion of the professor.
2) [Simba] will meet three times by the end of the semester with Dean [Zazu] to discuss his relationship with the Honor Code and community standards. After each meeting, he will submit a short one-paragraph summary to Honor Council.
3) At the end of these meetings, [Simba] will write a reflective letter to be released with the abstract.
4) [Simba] will meet with Professor [Rafiki] to discuss his violation during the exam.

Final Resolutions:
1) The jury recommends that [Simba] will receive either a 0.0 or a 1.0 on his exam, left to the discretion of the professor.
2) [Simba] will meet three times by the end of this semester with Dean [Zazu] to discuss his relationship with the Honor Code and community standards. After each meeting, he will submit a short one-paragraph summary to Honor Council.
3) At the end of these meetings, [Simba] will write a reflective letter to be included with the abstract of this trial.
4) [Simba] will meet with Professor [Rafiki] to discuss his violation during the exam.
5) The jury recommends that if [Simba] applies to a graduate or transfer school, he need not divulge his participation in this trial.

Post-Trial:
After Simba’s meeting with Professor Rafiki, the professor decided not to reduce Simba’s grade on the exam.

For reasons unknown to Honor Council of Spring 2015, this case slipped through the cracks and much of the information was lost. We are deeply troubled by this, and hope that this abstract will serve as a reminder for posterity to make sure that we have systems in place to account for the timely production of abstracts. We believe we have already preempted this from happening again with more thorough record keeping. We are confident that this kind of oversight will not happen again.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. What should Honor Council do with abstracts with large amounts of missing information? Is their release still valuable for community education? (Note that Honor Council has improved its record-keeping procedures since this trial, so such losses of information are less likely to occur in the future.)