

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case #45-9, Spring 2015
11/23/15

Members Present:

Alex Metcalf (presiding), Emilia Duno (clerk), Anika Zaman, Destiney Randolph, Allen Hu, Allie Salter, Sara Meadow, Isaac Batt, Bradley Hamilton

Ombuds: Sophie Schnietz

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student X and Student J of plagiarism for a lower level COMP course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student X's written statement
- Student J's written statement
- Class Syllabus
- Code of Student X
- Code of Student J
- Professor explanation
- Assignment 7

Plea:

Student J pled "In Violation"

Student X pled "Not in Violation"

Testimony:

In his testimony Student J said he committed the violation without Student X's knowledge. He claimed that Student X didn't know anything about what happened until Student X received a letter of accusation from the Council. Student J explained that one day in class Student X's computer wasn't working, and he asked to use Student J's computer. Later, while Student J was working on his assignment, he had problems with his code and noticed that Student X was still logged into stratocode. Student J then used Student X's code.

When asked how much code was used when Student J wrote his code, Student J responded that about 80-90% of his final code was directly taken from Student X.

In Student X's testimony, he stated that he would sit with Student J in class but never committed any violations. He remembered that he consistently had problems with saving and opening his code on his computer so he would always save his code on his computer and submit it on the computer of another student. He said that he did this from Student J's computer one day and that may be the reason for this.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because of the students' testimony and the evidence presented.

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 J or Student X committed the violation.

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

Yes: 9
 No: 0
 Abstentions: 0

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

Yes: 0
 No: 9
 Abstentions: 0

Penalty Deliberations:

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. The Council members decided that they would mitigate for Student J's cooperation, but aggravate for harming another student through involving them in an Honor Council proceeding.

While discussing the appropriate penalty, the Council decided that the assignment should be invalidated, and that there should be an additional punitive aspect to it as well.

Through discussion and several votes, the Council arrived at a 3 letter grade reduction.

Vote #6 What is the appropriate penalty for Student J?

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: 0
 3 letter grade reduction: 9
 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 J “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that he receive 3 letter grade reduction.

The Honor Council thus finds Student X “Not In Violation” of the Honor code.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 45 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Emilia Duno
Clerk