Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 17, Fall 2014
March 9, 2015

Members Present:
Hurst Williamson (presiding), Emilia Duno (clerk), Alex Metcalf, Allen Hu, Destiney Randolph, Helen Sharpless, Komal Agarwal, Yash Tarkunde, Jacob Schneckloth

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 humanities course.

Evidence Submitted:
- Letter of Accusation
- Student A’s written statement
- Student B’s written statement
- Exams 3, 4 and 5 for Student A and Student B
- Course Grade Roster
- Course Syllabus
- Witness Statement

Plea:
Student A pled “In Violation”
Student B pled “In Violation”

Testimony:
Student A claimed the violation occurred last October or November. He stated he did send Student B various answers to the problems that were asked of him but he did all the work on the exam on his own. He remembers sending 2b in exam 3 and 5b and 5c in exam 4.

Student B completed questions 2b and 2d on exam 3 and the last two questions on exam 4. He then texted Student A and asked him to send him the answers to check if they got the same thing but did not explicitly state that he was not done with his own exam. He found that Student A’s answers were more reasonable and then revised his answer. He claimed to have completed the rest of all three exams on his own. This was verified by the witness who saw him time and take his exam as they were preparing for another presentation together. Student A calculated the parts he collaborated on was worth 10%.

Verdict Deliberations:
Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because both students claimed to be in violation and identified the questions in their written statements.
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.

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

Penalty Deliberations:
Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances.
Members agreed to mitigate for cooperation for both Student A and B
No aggravating factors were found.

Some council members believed that we should take into account intent.
Repeat offence made it hard to believe that Student A did not know whether or not his answers were being used to commit an Honor Code violation.

Vote #1: What is the appropriate penalty for Student A?
F in the course and 3 semesters of suspension: 0
F in the course and 2 semesters of suspension: 0
F in the course and 1 semester of suspension: 0
F in the course: 7
3 letter grade reduction: 1
2 letter grade reduction: 1
1 letter grade reduction: 0
Letter of Reprimand: 0
Abstentions: 0

Vote #2: What is the appropriate penalty for Student B?
F in the course and 3 semesters of suspension: 0
F in the course and 2 semesters of suspension: 0
F in the course and 1 semester of suspension: 2
F in the course: 7
3 letter grade reduction: 0
2 letter grade reduction: 0
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 he receive an F in the course. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to his record.

The Honor Council thus finds Student B “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that he receive an F in the course. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to his record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 2 hours 10 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Maria Emilia Duno
Clerk