

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case #40, Spring 2016
March 30, 2016

Members Present:

Katie Jensen (presiding), Owais Syed (clerk), Joann Kim, Sofia Yi, Haiho Liu, Matt Roorda, Jake Reinhart, Dessy Akinfenwa (observing), Hector Chairez (observing),

Ombuds: Aaron Shaw

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of an assignment for a LOWER level COMP course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Syllabus
- Assignment 4
- Assignment 4 Student solution
- Class Honor Code Policy
- Student Assignment 3 Code
- Student Assignment 4 Code
- TA Solution

Plea:

Student A pled "in violation"

Testimony:

Student A discussed looking at recipes first before looking at the TA solution. Then he wrote his own code. In this case, Student A mentioned accidentally turning in the TA code with his own recipes. Student A talked about how he very regularly follows this process.

Student A mentioned taking the TA solution from Coursera, an online platform, from a prior year, but did not verify with the professor. Student mentioned the similarity of the code with the TA solution, and made few modifications. Student A denied copying directly from the TA solution, but reported that similarities of numbers were a result of making sure the code was reporting the same solutions as the answer key. Student A closed by stating that turning in the TA solution was an accident.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the student did not submit his own code and also pled in violation.

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

Yes: 6

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: 6

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

Penalty Deliberations:

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances.

Council members mentioned that the honor code policy very clearly states that students may not use more than two lines of code, which was violated in this case. Thus, there was no need to mitigate for any reason.

Council members based the penalty by looking at the 5% weight of the assignment, and then adding a punitive aspect.

Vote #3: What is the appropriate penalty for Student A?

2 letter grade reduction: 0

1 letter grade reduction: 6

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 “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that he receive 1 letter grade reduction. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to his record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 35 minutes

Respectfully submitted,

Owais Syed

Clerk