

**Abstract of the Honor Council**  
**Case 45, Spring 2023**  
**09/05/2023**

**Members Present:**

Pedro Ribeiro (presiding), Jae Kim (clerk), Neha Kohli, Bora Göbekli, Kabir Borle, Naidhruv Ananth Iyer, Todd Hao (observing)

**Ombuds:** Vinay Joshi

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Students A and B of unauthorized collaboration for an upper-level SOSOC course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

**Evidence Submitted:**

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A final exam
- Student B final exam
- Student A annotated final exam
- Student B annotated final exam
- Random sample of final exams
- Exam submission timestamps
- Student A written statement
- Student B written statement
- Student A submitted evidence

**Plea:**

Student A pled “Not in Violation”

Student B pled “Not in Violation”

**Testimony:**

Student A opened by stating that they took the exam at home and at a different time than Student B. Student A stated that the similarities could be a result of their collaboration in studying for the exams, and the tutor they share. Student A re-emphasized that there was no communication between them during the time period in which the online exam was open.

A witness called by Student A stated that Student A took the exam alone, and did not communicate with anyone during the exam.

Student B stated that they took the exam at an entirely different time than student A and that the instructor for the course may have a personal bias against them. Student B stated that the similarities between their exams could be a result of a shared misunderstanding of certain topics, as well as the tutor they share. Student B re-emphasized that they did not communicate at all during the time period in which the online exam was open.

A witness called by Student B stated that Student B took the exam alone.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation did not occur because the nature of the course material could have led to the observed similarities between the exams. Although council members acknowledged that Student A's and Student B's exams exhibited a much higher degree of similarity than the random samples, council members agreed that the ways in which the students interacted with their shared tutor could've contributed to the observed similarities between the exams.

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

Yes: 4

No: 2

Abstain: 0

**Decision:**

The Honor Council thus finds Student A and Student B "Not In Violation" of the Honor Code.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 2 hours 19 minutes

Respectfully submitted,  
Jae Kim

Clerk