A group of students is accused of prohibited receiving of aid on a project on the grounds that the individual giving aid was not assigned to that group. In general, a knowledgeable student helping other students who are not proficient in a subject is generally encouraged and even systematized in the form of tutoring. It can be presumed that the intention of the student giving aid was to help his or her peers in the understanding of the subject rather than maliciously attempting to give that group an advantage over the other students. However, the recommendation for this case is dependent on the policies set forth by the professor for the course and the project specifically.

The purpose of the Honor Board and its policies is to ensure that no student is given an unfair advantage over his or her peers. Cases such as giving or receiving unauthorized aid on an exam is a perfect case of one student (the aid receiver) receiving an unfair advantage (help from another student) that no other student in the class is receiving. In this case, however, the situation is not as clear. The student giving aid to the other group could have, when finished with the group in question, gone around helping other groups as well if he or she had not been detained by the TA. In fact, considering the nature of the aid was most likely to simply assist students in need rather than maliciously give an unfair advantage, it is likely that the student giving aid would have helped others. Furthermore, the project that aid was given on was a group project, which means the original intention of the project by the professor was to allow students to work with each other, provide support to each other, and reach a goal together, which is in contrast to that of an exam. The only reason the aid giver in this case was not in the group receiving aid in the first place was by mere chance during the separation and distribution of group members.

However, as aforementioned, this situation is still dependent upon the policies of the class and project. If the professor expressly stated that group members are to only aid their own group and not interact with any other group, then this act is a clear violation of the professor's policy and constitutes an explicit giving of unauthorized aid. On the other hand, if such a directive was not issued, this means the student giving aid and the group receiving aid were completely unaware of the professor or TA's reservations about groups aiding each other, and thus could not have known that such aid was unauthorized. This requirement of faculty to explicitly state their policies on group work is outlined in Section 3.02 of the Honor Board Constitution.

In the case that the professor had stated such aid as being unauthorized, then according to the penalty matrix both groups must receive a minimum punishment of partial credit on the assignment and a removable dean's star pending ethics course. The student giving aid completed his or her assignment, but used power tools while knowingly going against the professor's policy. The students receiving aid let the other student complete their project while not doing anything to stop the unauthorized aid. From this information, it can be determined that the ethics of the aid giver are more in question than that of the receivers, but the aid giver still put work into his or her project whereas the receivers did not. Therefore, it is recommended that the aid giver receive the punishment of partial credit on the assignment with removable dean's star pending an ethics course while the receiving group gets a zero on the assignment and removable dean's star pending essay. (Note that this was a purposeful mix of the minimum and maximum punishments, not a mistake.) However, of course, as aforementioned, if the professor had not explicitly prohibited inter-group aid, then the case is moot and no students shall receive punishment, although the professor is free to give partial credit to the students receiving aid since they did not complete their project entirely on their own.