

**Abstract of the Honor Council**  
**Case 13-5, Fall 2016**  
**January 26, 2017**

**Members Present:**

Katie Jensen (presiding), Alex Metcalf (clerk), Natalie Swanson, Ellen Diemert, Peter Rizzi, Sofia Yi

**Ombuds:** Natalie Danckers

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and B of collaboration in a lower level COMP course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

**Evidence Submitted:**

- Letter of Accusation
- Written statements of the students
- Code for both students
- Screenshot of code exchange

**Plea:**

Student A pled “In Violation”

Student B pled “In Violation”

**Testimony:**

Student A stated that he worked with Student B during much of this project, but said that their collaboration was not in violation. However, Student A also stated that he sent Student B the test cases for this assignment, but noted that the test cases are a relatively small fraction of the total code required. Student A stated that his design was more general, but Student B used a different design that was more focused. Even though much of the code is similar, the Student stated that his work in a previous project informed his design choices. Student A stated that he and Student B discussed design, but did not share code during the first half of the assignment. It was only during the second week, according to him, that he shared the test cases with Student B. When questioned, Student A stated that the role of a test case was to ensure that code was functioning correctly, but test cases in this class were graded for code coverage, or what fraction of the code is run by a set of test cases.

In his opening statement, Student B stated that he was in violation, but only for exchanging test cases – the other code similarities were due to allowed collaboration. In this class, the test cases were used to assess the functionality of functions.

Student A’s closing statement reiterated that he was in violation, but only for the exchange of test cases. He again restated that part of his assignment was not in violation.

Before his closing statement, Student B referenced the highlighted portions of the submitted code, which indicated that previous work was used for designing the code. Student B began his closing statement by stating that he was in violation, provided a quick assessment of the amount of code copied directly, and finished out his statement by thanking the Council.

### **Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because of 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. Council members saw no reason to conclude 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 did not see any aggravating factors, but considered mitigating for amount of the assignment not in violation.

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

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 |
| 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,  
Alex Metcalf  
Clerk