

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 32, Spring 2016
May 2, 2016

Members Present:

Alex Metcalf (presiding), Reece Rosenthal (clerk), Jake Weinhardt, Ike Arjmand, Alex Metcalf, Desi Sophie Yi, Hector Chaides, Bradley Hamilton

Ombuds: Kenton Whitmire

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of collaborating on a take-home examination for an upper level computational and applied mathematics course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Student B's written statement
- 47 Sample Tests
- Professor Clarification
- Grading Rubric
- Final Problem Statements (Exam)
- Exams of both students
- Syllabus

Plea:

Student A pled "not in violation."

Testimony:

Student A indicated that, while doing the work of the class, it is often the case that students have very similar models. There is a possibility, the student contended, that the solutions be very similar. According to the accused student, the professor taught the class in a certain way, and group work was encouraged on certain sets of problems; thus, there were bound to be similarities between answering styles.

Plea:

Student B pled "not in violation"

Testimony:

Student B stated that collaboration was not necessary, as she took the class in a pass/fail format. The student stated that she and Student A studied together often due to the fact that they were both approved for the class late; thus, the notation is similar because the students learned and studied together.

Student B also indicated that there was nothing abnormal about her test responses – the verbiage was similar due to the fact that the test was open notes, and the two student’s notes must have been similar due to their study habits (i.e. studying together).

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation had not occurred because it was impossible to determine whether or not the similarities had occurred due to the similarities between notes or collaboration. In other words, there was not a preponderance of the evidence to indicate that the students had collaborated on the examination.

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

Yes: 2

No: 7

Abstentions: 0

Decision:

The Honor Council thus finds Student A and Student B “Not in Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that they receive no penalty.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 45 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Reece Rosenthal
Clerk