

**Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 22B, Spring 2010
Wednesday, April 21 2010**

Members Present:

Hilary Baker-Jennings (presiding), Austin Edwards (clerk), Trey Burns, Chris Koops, Adam Hartman, Jeff Worne, Melissa Fwu

Due to unique circumstances of this case, the panel was reduced to 7 members, with the consent of the Accused Student and the Assistant Dean of Student Judicial Programs.

Ombuds: Darren Li

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of collaborating on an exam for an upper level ELEC course.

Student B had withdrawn under Article XII.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Student B's written statement
- Course syllabus
- Copy of exam prompt
- Student A's exam
- Student B's exam
- Deposition from professor
- Exam solutions

Plea:

Student A pled "not in violation."

Testimony:

During the opening statement of the accused student, Student A said that her story was the same as in the accused students' written statements provided during the investigation. She said that Student B came over to Student A's house to ask about some concepts about the course before taking the exam. During her explanations, Student A got a phone call and had to step out of the room. In her written statement, Student B said that while Student A was out of the room, she took pictures of Student A's exam, which was sitting on her desk, using her cell phone and without Student A's knowledge.

Council members asked if Student A discussed specific questions from the exam and she said that she did not. Student B had come to the study session with a list of concepts already written out that she wanted to discuss.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that there was clear and convincing evidence that a violation occurred because of the written statements from the students, the testimony presented by Student A, and the similarities between the exams. Members thought Student B copied from Student A based on the testimony of Student A and the written statement from Student B.

Straw Poll #1: Is there clear and convincing evidence that a violation occurred?

Yes: 7
No: 0
Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A committed the violation. Council members said that they did not find any evidence to find Student A is in violation. They said that there is no evidence to suggest that Student A was aware that Student B was taking pictures of her exam.

Straw Poll #2: Is there clear and convincing evidence that Student A is “In Violation?”

Yes: 0
No: 7
Abstentions: 0

Straw Polls #1 and #2 made binding.

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

Time of testimony and deliberations: 9 minutes, 13 seconds

Respectfully submitted,
Austin Edwards
Clerk