Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 64, Spring 2014
9/15/2014

Members Present:
Hurst Williamson (presiding), Cesar Udave (clerk), Allen Hu, Shayak Sengupta, Jacob Schneckloth, Destiny Randoph, Sarah Frazier, Mitch Massey, Katie Stewart

Ombuds: Jayme Smith

Letter of Accusation:
The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of unauthorized collaboration for an upper level CHBE course.

Evidence Submitted:
- Letter of Accusation
- Additional Letter of Accusation
- Student A’s written statement
- Student B’s written statement
- Course Syllabus

Plea:
Student A pled “NOT IN VIOLATION”
Student B pled “NOT IN VIOLATION”

Testimony:
- Student A – She brought laptop with additional evidence (which consisted of homeworks and an Owlspace announcement where professor stated what could be used on exam – anything professor posted on Owlspace including course notes and homework solutions). Student A did not collaborate with anyone and did not go over 4 hours. Student A claims to know Student B. Student A studied in a group of about 4 people including Student B. Student A found similar homework problems to most of the exam question, but could not find similar homework problems to exam question 2. Student A justifies similar mistakes on exam by saying that he studied with Student B.

- Student B – She had not seen the final exam until 2 weeks ago and the two exams are very similar because there is usually only one way to do the questions. She claims to have studied with Student A and 3 or so more students. Exam was due at 5pm, but she turned it in close to 8pm. She identified specific differences (about 4 differences) between her test and Student A’s exam. Claims that most of the exam questions were very similar to previous homework questions.

Verdict Deliberations:
Student A
Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation did NOT occur because

Shayak said that he is skeptical of the fact that people studying together and wants to hear from people. Jacob claims that a violation has not occurred because questions 3 and 4 on the exam were closely related to homework problems which were allowed on the exam. Sarah also believes no violation occurred because question 2 is closely related to what the teacher said. Hurst remains skeptical about question 2

Straw Poll #1: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred?
Yes: 0
No: 9
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 6 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Cesar Udave
Clerk