

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 13-4, Fall 2016
January 26, 2017

Members Present:

Katie Jensen (presiding), Ryan Carlson (clerk), Natalie Swanson, Peter Rizzi, and Ellen Diemert

Ombuds: Sam Morimoto

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of giving and receiving unauthorized aid on a homework assignment for a lower level computer science 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
- An online chat transcript between the students

Plea:

Student A pled "In Violation."

Student B pled "In Violation."

Testimony:

Student A said she and Student B had collaborated throughout the semester on various projects. She said that on the concerned assignment, Student B asked her to share code through an online chat with her due to the other accused student being absent from campus at the time. She stated that she found some coding methods online and utilized them in her code.

Student B said she and Student A had collaborated on the assignment within the bounds of the Honor Code. Later, the student said she decided to leave campus, and asked for an extension on the assignment. She said she contacted Student A, asking for further advice on the assignment. She then asked for Student A to send her code to her. Student B stated that she received what she believes was Student A's entire code and looked at it. She said that she believes she may have copied directly from Student A's code. Student B believes that a very small amount of her code was influenced by Student A's code.

Student A closed her testimony with reiterating that she and Student A had collaborated prior to the potential violation within the rules of the syllabus. She said that while her actions were not sanctioned by the syllabus, she was only trying to help her friend.

Student B closed her testimony by reiterating that she had attempted to refrain from looking at Student A's code, but eventually could not avoid it.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the accused students either gave or received unauthorized aid on the assignment.

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 Students A and B committed the violation. The council saw no reason otherwise.

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 agreed to mitigate by the amount of the assignment demonstrably not in violation. The council saw no aggravating circumstances. The council found that a 1 letter grade reduction was appropriate due to the weight of the assignment and the census penalty structure.

Vote #4: 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: 0
 F in the course: 0
 3 letter grade reduction: 0
 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

Vote #5: What is the appropriate penalty for Student 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:	0
3 letter grade reduction:	0
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 and Student B “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that they receive a 1 letter grade reduction. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to their record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 1 hour

Respectfully submitted,
Ryan Carlson
Clerk