

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 13, Spring 2019
2/12/19

Members Present:

Virginia Xie (presiding), Caroline Brehm (clerk), Stefano Romano, Rohit Chouhan, Henry Ulrich, Angela Liu

Ombuds: Ashley Tsang, Laura Li (observing)

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of cheating on a final exam for an upper level NAVA course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Professor statement
- Student A's final exam
- Professor clarification
- Log of Student A's phone call
- Performance Review

Plea:

Student A pled "not in violation".

Testimony:

Student A began his testimony by explaining how he had already gone in front of the Performance Review Board, which means that he did not commit a violation according to the head of the department. He did not look at his phone during the testing period. He had an hour and fifteen minutes to complete the exam, and when the professor came into the room and saw Student A on his phone, the hour and fifteen minutes was up. He checked in with the proctor after the hour and fifteen minutes were up and did not alter his exam after this time. Student A stated that he had received an incoming phone call when the professor walked into the room, which is why Student A was looking at his phone. Student A then presented his phone log, which showed he did not make a phone call during the exam time, since there were no answered calls during the exam period. He also never accessed the Internet during the exam period. He stated that the professor had never mentioned that the exam period was longer than one hour and fifteen minutes, so he assumed it was this long since all previous exams in that class had been an hour and fifteen minutes long.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation did not occur because there was not sufficient evidence to support the claim that the student received unauthorized aid by being on his phone during the exam period. The

syllabus never explicitly stated that having a phone out during the exam was a violation of the Honor Code.

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

Yes: 0

No: 6

Abstentions: 0

Decision:

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

Time of testimony and deliberations: 40 minutes

Respectfully submitted,

Caroline Brehm,

Clerk