

**Abstract of the Honor Council**  
**Case 31, Spring 2017**  
**April 2, 2017**

**Members Present:**

Katie Jensen (presiding), Sofia Yi (clerk), Ellen Diemert, Ricky Robinson, Ryan Carlson, Siddharth Gorantla, Eva Lin (observing), James Suffoletta (observing), Maheen Khizar (observing), Sage McAdams (observing)

**Ombuds:** Matt Nobles

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of collaborating on a quiz for a lower level philosophy course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

**Evidence Submitted:**

- Letter of Accusation
- Copy of Quiz Questions
- Quizzes of Student A and Student B
- Course Syllabus
- Google Search for “Neuron Doctrine”

**Plea:**

Student A pled “In Violation.”  
Student B pled “In Violation.”

**Testimony:**

Student A stated that Student B did not feel well on the day of the quiz, so he did not attend class. Student A then claimed that he preemptively asked Student B if there were to be a quiz in class that day, if he would like Student A to take the quiz for him (Student B). Student A stated that Student B did not object to him taking the quiz for him. Thus, when the class had this surprise quiz, Student A submitted two quizzes with the exact same answers; one for himself and one under Student B’s name. Student A stated that he did not use the Internet or any disallowed resources when completing the two quizzes. He closed by stating that he did not realize the severity of his actions and that he would like to take full responsibility for the violation of the Honor Code.

Student B stated that he was not feeling well on the day of the quiz, so he did not attend class. He said that Student A texted him, telling him that there was an in-class surprise quiz. Student B then claimed that he asked Student A to submit a quiz for him, which Student A did. Student B stated that he had no knowledge or input into the answers Student B submitted for him on the in class quiz and he expressed regret for his actions.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because both students stated that they had violated the Honor Code by collaborating on the quiz.

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

Yes: 6 + 4 observing

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A committed the violation. Council members saw no reason otherwise.

Vote #2: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student A is “In Violation?”

Yes: 6 + 4 observing

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student B committed the violation. Council members saw no reason otherwise.

Vote #3: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student B is “In Violation?”

Yes: 6 + 4 observing

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

**Penalty Deliberations:**

Council members opened by discussing mitigating and aggravating circumstances. The Council saw no mitigating or aggravating factors.

The CPS penalty for this case, based on the weight of the assignment, is a 1 letter grade reduction. Council members unanimously agreed a 1 letter grade reduction to be the appropriate penalty for Students A and B.

Vote #4: What is the appropriate penalty for Student A and 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: 0

F in the course: 0

3 letter grade reduction: 0

2 letter grade reduction: 0

1 letter grade reduction: 6 + 4 observing

Letter of Reprimand: 0

Abstentions: 0

**Decision:**

The Honor Council thus finds Student A and Student B “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that they receive a 1 letter grade reduction.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 45 minutes

Respectfully submitted,  
Sofia Yi  
Clerk