

**Abstract of the Honor Council**  
**Case 12, Fall 2013**  
**January 26, 2014**

**Members Present:**

Kaleb Underwood (presiding), Isabelle Lelogeais (clerk), Seth Lauer, Komal Agarwal, Michael Jin, Erin Rieger, Shantan Cheemerla, Tanvi Nagpal, Lynn Fahey

**Ombuds:** Aubrey Sirtautas

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of unauthorized collaboration on a homework assignment for a lower level Chemistry course.

**Evidence Submitted:**

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's Written Statement
- Student B's Written Statement
- Course Syllabus
- Student A Assignment
- Student B Assignment
- Professor Deposition

**Plea:**

Student A pled "In Violation." Student B pled "In Violation."

**Testimony:**

Student A began by stating that he had worked with Student B on various aspects of the course throughout the semester. Student A had asked Student B to borrow his homework so that he could get a better understanding of the material. He had not intended to copy Student B's homework. The night the homework was due, Student A had run out of time, and copied Student B's answers verbatim due to stress.

Student B said that this violation resulted from miscommunication between the two students. He allowed Student A to use his homework as a tool to help him understand the material and complete his work. Student B was not aware that Student A would copy his answers, and regrets that he was not in the room to discuss the questions with the other student rather than simply providing his answers.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred both because of the Students' admissions and the exact similarity between the two homeworks.

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

Yes: 9

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A committed the violation. The evidence and Student A's own admission compelled the council to find him "In Violation."

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

Yes: 9

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student B committed a violation. Looking at the syllabus for the course, the Council thought that because collaboration was allowed and because nothing prohibits students from seeing each other's work, Student B is "Not in Violation."

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

Yes: 0

No: 9

Abstentions: 0

### **Penalty Deliberations:**

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. All Council members agreed that mitigation for the weight of the assignment was warranted. Some of the Council considered cooperation as a mitigating factor because Student A's disclosure helped to find Student B "Not it Violation." All members of the Council believed that a one letter grade reduction was the appropriate penalty for Student B.

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

2 letter grade reduction: 0

1 letter grade reduction: 9

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 a one letter grade reduction. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to his record. The Honor Council thus finds Student B "Not in Violation" of the Honor Code.

Time of testimony and deliberations: --:--

Respectfully submitted,  
Isabelle Lelogeais  
Clerk