

**Abstract of the Honor Council  
Case 22, Spring 2017  
3/30/17**

**Members Present:**

Katie Jensen (presiding), Alex Metcalf (clerk), Joanne Kim, Sofia Yi, Allie Salter, Ellen Diemert, Siddharth Gorantla (observing), Sean Olsen (observing)

**Ombuds:** Sam Morimoto

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of looking at another classmate's exam in a lower level physics course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

**Evidence Submitted:**

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Exams of both students
- Solution to Exam
- Photo of seating arrangement
- Syllabus
- Study logs for both students
- Statement of other student

**Plea:**

Student A pled "Not In Violation".

**Testimony:**

In Student A's opening statement, she stated that she studied extensively with the student she was accused of cheating off of. Student A said she was sitting behind the other student, but was unable to see the paper of the other student.

During questioning, Student A stated that everything she learned was from the other student, as the other student tutored her. According to her, any similar answers were due to the time spent studying together, but any different answers were due to Student A's different thought processes. The student stated that all the documented time spent in study hall was spent on physics.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the exams were very similar, especially due to the lack of work displayed by Student A on correct numerical answers.

Vote #1: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred?

Yes:            6+2 observing

No: 0  
Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A committed the violation. Council members did not see a reason otherwise.

**Vote #2:** Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student A is “In Violation?”  
Yes: 6+2 observing  
No: 0  
Abstentions: 0

**Penalty Deliberations:**

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. Council members did not see a reason to mitigate or aggravate.

The CPS penalty for this case, based on the weight of the assignment, is a 3 letter grade reduction. Council members decided this was the appropriate penalty in this case based on the CPS penalty and the lack of mitigating or aggravating factors.

**Vote #3:** 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:	0
3 letter grade reduction:	6+2 observing
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 she receive a three letter grade reduction.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 35 minutes

Respectfully submitted,  
Alex Metcalf  
Clerk