

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 13-2, Fall 2016
January 22, 2017

Members Present:

Katie Jensen (presiding), Alex Metcalf (clerk), Ellen Diemert, Ryan Carlson, Reece Rosenthal, Joanne Kim

Ombuds: Matt Nobles

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of collaborating on an assignment for a lower level computer course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Written statements
- Code

Plea:

Student A pled “not in violation.”

Student B pled “in violation.”

Testimony:

Student A stated that Student B asked him for advice on the project. Student A gave advice, but believes that his advice was not substantial enough. He stated that he never showed Student B his code, but he was not “super secure” with his laptop, and there is a possibility that Student B would have access to his computer.

Student A stated his IDE would have been available, and accessing the code required would not have been complicated.

Student B said the weighting of the assignment as described by the professor in the letter of accusation was not accurate, because the professor miscalculated the weights of all assignments within the class. The student stated that he opened Student A’s computer, accessed his code, and over the course of “half an hour”, used the code written by Student A to structure his code.

In Student A’s closing statement, he reiterated that any advice was verbal, insignificant, and not a violation, while acknowledging that Student B would have had access to his computer.

Student B’s closing statement highlighted his previously mentioned dispute over the grade, before thanking the Council.

Verdict Deliberations:

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

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 and Student B committed the violation. The Council decided, based on evidence and testimony, that Student B committed a violation, and Student A did not.

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

Yes: 0
 No: 6
 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 did not mitigate for any reasons. However, Council members aggravated heavily for the theft of another’s work. Discussion revolved around the nature of declaring a violation a “heinous violation”. However, the Council decided that declaring the violation heinous was not necessary, but still aggravated heavily for the theft of another’s work.

Vote #5: 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: 4
 F in the course: 2
 3 letter grade reduction: 0
 2 letter grade reduction: 0
 1 letter grade reduction: 0
 Letter of Reprimand 0
 Abstentions: 0

Decision:

The Honor Council thus finds Student A “Not In Violation” of the Honor Code and Student B “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that he receive an F in the course and a 1 semester suspension.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 1 hour 15 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Alex Metcalf
Clerk