Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 26, Spring 2013
March 16, 2013

Members Present:
Trey Burns (presiding), Seth Lauer (clerk), John Cavallo, David French, Michael Jin,
Parker Dalton, Isabelle Lelogeais, John King, Brooke Evans

Ombuds: Kristina Vu

Letter of Accusation:
The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of copying of a midterm exam for an upper level statistics 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
- Professor Deposition
- Expert Depositions
- Student A’s Notes & Previous Assignment in Class
- Course Textbook
- Student A’s Facebook Conversations
- Student A’s Printing Charges
- Student A’s Internet Browsing History
- Student A’s Drawn Suite Diagram

Plea:
Student A pled not in violation
Student B pled not in violation

Testimony:
Student A explained her evidence and the process by which she did the exam. She also explained the process by which she arrived at certain problem solutions.

She spoke to the fact that Student B false-dated her test based on using a shared textbook.

Student A called Witness A who explained the process by which the textbook was shared and times she thought each test was taken.

Student A explained that she would not have motivation to assist Student B with her exam.
Student A called Witness A again to explain the timeline by which Witness A woke up Student A.

Student A stated that she left her exam in the common room with her laptop so she could better find it in the morning. Student A drew a diagram to show where she left the test and how Student B might have accessed her test. Student A walked through various problems and highlighted similarities between the tests.

Student B read a friend’s statement that shows she completed her exam in Fondren library and stated that she completed the exam with another student’s textbook.

Student B stated that she went back to her off-campus apartment after she finished playing video games with other suitemates.

Student B talked about the exchange of the textbook and stated that she believed she never received the textbook from Student A after she gave it to her.

Student B stated she did not access Student A’s exam and explained how she arrived at certain conclusions on each problem.

Student B discussed when and how she borrowed the textbook from another member of the class and reiterated the timeline she checked the exam with Witness A’s textbook after she had completed the exam.

Witness A was called so Student B may have a chance to ask questions. She discussed once again the exchange of the textbook.

Student A specified that outside resources were not used during the test and repeated her version of the timeline of the textbook exchange and talked about the conversations that occurred between the students before and after Student A took the exam. Student A discussed again how she arrived at certain conclusions for questions on the exam. Student A pointed out that Student B’s often failed to attend class.

Student B said she had a conversation with Student A the morning after Student A took her test and discussed that it might be possible to find notes and browsing history if given time.

Council Members voted unanimously to ask Student B if she was willing to produce her browsing history for the purposes of determining whether or not it would help decide the case. Student B said she would not be able to produce the requested evidence, and council members did not consider it.

Student A made her closing statement reiterating once again the textbook timeline and the fact that she left her test in the common room until the next morning when she turned it in. She stated that she did not cheat off Student B and would be unwilling to allow Student B to use her midterm exam.
Student B made her closing statement reiterating the time she took the exam and that she borrow Witness A’s textbooks only to check her answers for her comfort.

**Verdict Deliberations:**
Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence does not support that a violation occurred because neither the expert depositions nor the students’ and witness’ testimonies show there was a violation.

Council members stated that even though we each have our own suspicions, there is not a way for us to without a doubt state that the preponderance of the evidence could support that there was certainly a violation.

Even though the exams look strikingly similar, the expert depositions do not adequately support that there was a violation.

Straw Poll #1: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred?
Yes: 2
No: 7
Abstentions: 0

Time of testimony and deliberations: 2 hours and 21 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Seth Lauer
Clerk