

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 7, Fall 2013
November 19, 2013

Members Present:

Adriana Bracho (presiding), Isabelle Lelogeais (clerk), Seth Lauer, Clinton Willbanks, Michael Farner, Aaroh Parikh, Josiah Grace, Michael Jin, Cesar Udave, Lynn Fahey (Observing), Claire Bonnyman (Observing), Luke van der Spoel

Ombuds: Christina Vu

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of unauthorized collaboration on an exam for a lower level Math course.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Student B's Written Statement
- Course Syllabus
- Student A's Exam
- Student B's Exam
- Exam Answer Key
- Sample Student Exams
- Student A and Student B Sample Homeworks

Plea:

Student A pled "Not in Violation." Student B pled "Not in Violation."

Testimony:

Student A began by addressing each point addressed in the letter of accusation. He discussed the seating configuration on the day of the exam. Student A and Student B happened to sit together on the day of the exam due to lack of seating. In addition, Student A continued to say that he worked with Student B on every written homework assignment for the course and that they studied together frequently. He also mentioned that he and Student B met together with the same tutor for this class once a week. He added that work with his tutor was very focused on abstract concepts for problem solving that could lead to similar thought processes. He continued to address his thought process for each point of similarity mentioned by the accuser. Student A said that at no point in time did he look at Student B's exam. In closing, he brought up the fact that the expert depositions did not support that a violation had occurred. He stated that he took the test within the parameters of the Honor Code.

Student B began by saying that the testing room was very full, and that he sat next to Student A due to the crowded seating conditions. He continued to say that he sits next

to Student A every day during class. He mentioned that he did not see Student A's test at any point in time and that he was entirely focused on his own exam. Student B then addressed each point of similarity addressed by the letter of accusation. The similarities in the two tests, he suggested, could be explained by the fact that he studied with Student A frequently and that they used the same tutor for the course. He continued to mention that although there are some similarities between the two exams, there are also many differences. He noted specific instances where he wrote more than Student A. He also mentioned that he took the entire time allotted for the exam, while Student A left early. In summation, he said that he took this test in complete accordance with the Honor Code.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members did not believe that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because there were many differences between the two exams, both in minute mechanics and in conceptual approach. In addition, the noted similarities could adequately be explained by the extensive collaboration of the two students throughout the course. Finally, members cited the fact that the expert depositions did not support that a violation had occurred.

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

Yes: 0

No: 9+3 Observing

Abstentions: 0

Decision:

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

Time of testimony and deliberations: 1 Hour and 16 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Isabelle Lelogeais
Clerk