

**Abstract of the Honor Council  
Case 28, Spring 2014  
2014**

**Members Present:**

Isabelle Lelogeais (presiding), Brooke Evans (clerk), Chloe Tula, Shayak Sengupta, Ashantan Cheemerla, Erin Reiger, Mitch Massey, Komal Agarwal, Allen Hu

**Ombuds:** Sarah Frazier

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A, Student B, and Student C of unauthorized collaboration on the 3<sup>rd</sup> exam in the COMP 100 course.

**Evidence Submitted:**

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Student B's written statement
- Student C's written statement
- Student A's Exam
- Student B's Exam
- Student C's Exam
- Sample Exams
- Blank Copy of Exam
- Exam solutions
- Nizar's Notes
- Professor deposition
- Course syllabus
- Instructions for exam

**Plea:**

Student A pled "In Violation."

Student B pled "In Violation."

Student C pled "In Violation."

**Testimony:**

Student A's testimony: Student A began exam independently, but took a break after experiencing trouble with the exam. Later, Student A finished exam after collaborating with Student B and Student C. Student A estimated that 65% of the exam was completed independently and that the exam was completed within the 60 minute time limit.

Student B's testimony: Student B called Student A for help on questions 5 and 6. Student B spent a total of 60 minutes on the exam in two sittings. Student B estimated that 75%-80% of the exam was completed independently.

Student C's testimony: Student C contacted and collaborated with Student A and then answered questions 5 and 6 of the exam after collaboration. Student C confirmed that the exam was completed in one sitting within the 60 minute time limit.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because each student's testimony in addition to the similarities evident in all three of the exams supported that a violation did occur.

Vote #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. A preponderance of the evidence supports that Student A is in violation. Student A's testimony in addition to the similarities between the exams support that Student A participated in unauthorized collaboration with Student B and Student C on the exam.

The Council then discussed whether or not Student B committed the violation. A preponderance of the evidence supports that Student B is in violation. Student B's testimony in addition to the similarities between the exams support that Student B participated in unauthorized collaboration with Student A on the exam.

The Council then discussed whether or not Student C committed the violation. A preponderance of the evidence supports that Student C is in violation. Student C's testimony in addition to the similarities between the exams support that Student A participated in unauthorized collaboration with Student A on the exam.

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

Yes: 9

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

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

Yes: 9

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

Vote #4: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student C is "In Violation?"

Yes: 9

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

**Penalty Deliberations:**

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. The discussion applied to all three accused students equally. The council discussed considering the weight of the assignment (13%), the amount of the assignment that is in violation (two questions involved in violation), and for cooperation which was integral to the council's ability to reach a decision.

Then, the council discussed whether or not the students should receive the same penalty. The discussion lead to the conclusion that all three students should receive the same penalty.

Then the council discussed the appropriate penalty that would apply to all students. A 2 letter grade reduction was the penalty discussed.

Vote #5: What is the appropriate penalty for Student A?

F in the course:	0
2 letter grade reduction:	9
1 letter grade reduction:	0
Letter of Reprimand	0
Abstentions:	0

3 letter grade reduction:	0
---------------------------	---

Vote #6: What is the appropriate penalty for Student B?

F in the course:	0
3 letter grade reduction:	0
2 letter grade reduction:	9
1 letter grade reduction:	0
Letter of Reprimand	0
Abstentions:	0

Vote #7: What is the appropriate penalty for Student C?

F in the course:	0
3 letter grade reduction:	0
2 letter grade reduction:	9
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 she receive a 2 letter grade reduction. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to her record.

The Honor Council thus finds Student B "In Violation" of the Honor Code and recommends that she receive a 2 letter grade reduction. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to her record.

The Honor Council thus finds Student C “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that she receive a 2 letter grade reduction. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to her record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 50min-02sec

Respectfully submitted,  
Brooke Evans  
Clerk