Abstract of the Honor Council  
Case 13, Fall 2014  
February 3, 2015

Members Present:  
Hurst Williamson (presiding), Julia Liu (clerk), Alex Metcalf, Jacob Schneckloth, Isabel Alison, Maria Montalvo, Mitchell Massey, Sarah Frazier, Anika Zaman

Ombuds: Natalie Danckers

Letter of Accusation:  
The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A, Student B, and Student C of unauthorized collaboration on a midterm exam in an upper level COMP course.

Evidence Submitted:  
- Letter of Accusation  
- Alternative Exams 1, 2, and 3  
- Course syllabus  
- Exam instructions  
- Student A’s exam  
- Student B’s exam  
- Student C’s exam  
- Written statements for all three students  
- Letter of accusation

Plea:  
Student A pled “not in violation.”

Student B pled “not in violation.”

Student C pled “not in violation.”

Testimony:

Student A in his opening statement said the three students in question prepared for the exam together prior to taking the exam. Student B and Student A conferred about the tests after the investigative meeting and noticed the similarities, but he still stands by the statement that they completed the exams separately. During discussion/preparations for the test, Student A said he did not take any notes. He turned in the exam to an office coordinator (he signed the exam in and out).

Student B in his opening statement said that he did not violate the honor code in regards to this exam. He took the exam the weekend before the exam was due in the evening. He turned the exam in one day before it was due. He said that they reviewed the lecture notes together and discussed concepts together. He said that the questions didn’t involve as much design as the professor claims and used much of the lecture notes to complete the
test. He did not use notes during the exam. He said that Student A is his roommate and they all reviewed the materials together with Student C, with whom he is not very familiar with.

Student C in his opening statement said he did the exam in his apartment by himself and didn’t cooperate with the other students or anyone else. He used the slides the professor provided during the exam. Student C said that he didn’t know Student A before preparation for this exam and met Student A through Student B. They studied the week before the midterm exam. They reviewed before they picked up the exam. Student C said they studied all the slides but not the papers. He proceeded to explain certain aspects of his exam and stated that his answers were unique.

Student A in his closing statement said again that he is not in violation of the honor code as he completed the exam on his down without collaboration. The three students studied together and went through the slides together, which resulted in similar understandings of the concepts and questions.

Student B in his closing statement said he did not violate the honor code under any circumstances. He did not cooperate with other students, but only went over the materials with the other students prior to picking up the exam.

Student C in his closing statement said he doesn’t think he did anything in this course to violate the honor code. He completed all of the exam by himself and wrote the answers by himself, only referring to the slides and papers the professor gave.

Verdict Deliberations:
Council members believed that there was not a preponderance of the evidence to support that a violation occurred because there was a lack of evidence supporting the claim that a violation occurred.

Some council members think there were too many red flags in terms of use of the study material. Most council members don’t think that a violation occurred due to the fact that most of the evidence doesn’t point toward collaboration.

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 “Not In Violation” of the Honor Code.

The Honor Council thus finds Student B “Not In Violation” of the Honor Code.

The Honor Council thus finds Student C “Not In Violation” of the Honor Code.
Time of testimony and deliberations: 1 hour and 20 minutes.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia Liu
Clerk