

**Abstract of the Honor Council**  
**Case 66, Spring 2016**  
**August 31, 2016**

**Members Present:**

Katie Jensen (presiding), Alex Metcalf (clerk), Hector Chaires, Angel Garces, Ike Arjmand, Reece Rosenthal

**Ombuds:** Kenton Whitmire

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of giving and receiving unauthorized aid on the final exam for an upper level management 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
- Syllabus
- Student A's Final Exam
- Student B's Final Exam
- Final Exam Questions
- Final Exam Key
- 4 Randomly Selected Final Exams for Comparison
- Case Studies
- Case Studies Solutions

**Plea:**

Student A pled "in violation".

Student B pled "in violation".

**Testimony:**

Student A:

Student A stated that her written statement summarized her actions. She said that she contacted Student B over a question in the exam. Student A brought up that the class' professor was changed for the last class, and she stated that the syllabus was also altered slightly without her awareness. According to the student, the old professor had said exams would be untimed, but this policy appears to have been changed. The student said that she was unaware of the weight of the exam and that the class OwlSpace was not updated to reflect the changing syllabus.

Before beginning her closing statement, the Council asked Student A to open up her OwlSpace page and locate the syllabus currently online. This syllabus appeared to be the same as the syllabus submitted by Student B and stated that the weight of the exam is

40%. For Student A's closing statement, she reiterated that she wished to cooperate fully with the Council.

Student B:

Student B began her testimony by stating that she made a call to Student A during the first question of the exam, and pointed the Council to her written statement. She went on to discuss the class syllabus, bringing in a syllabus that she stated was from the class.

The syllabus she submitted differed from the syllabus submitted by the accuser at a few points, including the weight of the exam (40% vs. 50%). Student B was unsure if the professor mentioned the increased weight of the exam. The student reinforced that she only consulted with Student A on the first question, stating that she followed the textbook for the other questions.

Student B was informed that the course OwlSpace page still had the old syllabus. For her closing statement, Student B thanked the Council for spending time on her case.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred, based on student testimony.

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

Yes: 6  
No: 0  
Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether the students committed the violation. Based on student testimony, the Council agreed that a preponderance of the evidence indicated that a violation occurred.

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

Yes: 6  
No: 0  
Abstentions: 0

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

Yes: 6  
No: 0  
Abstentions: 0

**Penalty Deliberations:**

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. Council members were split on whether mitigation was appropriate for this case. Some members felt that the entire exam was invalidated by the student's action because there was a lack of strong

evidence to indicate that the students did not collaborate on the other questions; other members felt that the violation was confined to the first question and therefore mitigation was required to avoid an overly punitive penalty.

After further discussion, the Council decided that an F in the course was the appropriate penalty for this violation.

Vote #5: What is the appropriate penalty for Students A and 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:	6
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 Students A and B “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that they receive an F in the course.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 45 minutes

Respectfully submitted,  
 Alex Metcalf  
 Clerk