

**Abstract of the Honor Council**  
**Case 34, Spring 2016**  
**April 14, 2016**

**Members Present:**

Alex Metcalf (presiding), Sara Meadow (clerk), Anika Zaman, Claire Bonnyman, Ellen Diemert, Jake Reinhart, Joanne Kim, Natalie Swanson, Reese Rosenthal

**Ombuds:** Natalie Dankers

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of cheating on a final exam for a graduate level Accounting course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

**Evidence Submitted:**

- Letter of Accusation from the professor
- Letter of Accusation from student B
- Student A's written statement
- Student B's written statement
- Student A final exam
- Student B final exam
- Course Syllabus
- Owl Space page for submitting final exam
- Letter from Professor to Students A and B
- Email communication between Student B and Professor

**Plea:**

Student A pled "in violation."

Student B pled "in violation."

**Testimony:**

Student A:

Student A said that she answered when Student B called on the phone with questions about the final exam. Student A said that only discussed concepts and only some of the questions were implicated. Student A noted that the exam was open book and open notes, and she did not directly give answers to Student B as the professor's letter suggested. Student A said only about 5-10% of the exam included parts that were discussed with Student B. Student A also noted that they self reported.

Student B:

Student B noted that she did not intend to gain unfair advantage and that Student A was part of her study group. Student B also noted that that although the Professor accused

them of exchanging papers, this is not what happened, and only concepts were discussed. Student B said she did not discuss with Student A before self reporting. Student B also showed the council the portions of the exam about which she asked Student A for help.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the students collaborated on the exam when this was not allowed by the honor code for the class.

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

Yes: 9  
 No: 0  
 Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A committed the violation.

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

Yes: 9  
 No: 0  
 Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student B committed the violation.

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

Yes: 9  
 No: 0  
 Abstentions: 0

**Penalty Deliberations:**

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. The Council believed there were no mitigating factors.

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

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:	9
3 letter grade reduction:	0
2 letter grade reduction:	0
1 letter grade reduction:	0
2/3 letter grade reduction	0

1/3 letter grade reduction	0
Letter of Reprimand	0
Abstentions:	0

Vote #5: What is the appropriate penalty for Student 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:	9
3 letter grade reduction:	0
2 letter grade reduction:	0
1 letter grade reduction:	0
2/3 letter grade reduction	0
1/3 letter grade reduction	0
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 both receive an F in the course. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to both of their records.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 41 minutes

Respectfully submitted,  
Sara Meadow  
Clerk