

**Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 13, Fall 2016
January 31st, 2017**

Members Present:

Katie Jensen (presiding), Allen Hu (clerk), Natalie Swanson, Adesola Akinfenwa, Ryan Carlson, Ellen Diemert, Grant Wilkinson (observing)

Ombuds: Laura Li

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of giving and receiving unauthorized aid for two assignments 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 A's addendum to written statement
- Student A's rubrics for Assignment 1 and Assignment 2
- Student A's code for Assignment 1 and Assignment 2
- Student A's code revisions
- Student B's code for Assignment 1 and Assignment 2

Plea:

Student A pled “In Violation.”

Student B pled “In Violation.”

Testimony:

Student A began by clarifying the nature of the assignment and course structure, as well as the amount of the assignments actually in violation. He further explained the extent of unauthorized aid that was given and received. He referenced evidence found in his written statement and addendum.

Student B began by clarifying the structure of the assignment with respect to grading in the course. He further explained the amount and extent of unauthorized aid that was given and received on these assignments, and reiterated arguments made in the written statement and addendum of Student A. He described the role of the part of assignment in violation in context to the larger assignment.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence, as well as the testimonies of both Student A and Student B, supported that a violation occurred.

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

Yes: 6 (and 1 observing)

No: 0
 Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A and Student B committed the violation. The Council agreed that both Student A and Student B committed a violation.

Vote: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student A is “In Violation?”
 Yes: 6 (and 1 observing)
 No: 0
 Abstentions: 0

Vote: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student B is “In Violation?”
 Yes: 6 (and 1 observing)
 No: 0
 Abstentions: 0

Penalty Deliberations:

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. The Council did not consider either cooperation or amount of the assignment in violation, but agreed to mitigate for the weight of the assignment in violation. No aggravating factors were discussed or considered.

Council members followed by discussing whether or not Student A and Student B deserved the same penalty. Due to the nature of the violation, the Council agreed that both students would receive the same penalty.

Council members agreed on a 2 letter grade reduction, due to the overall weight of the assignment in question (in accordance with the guidelines in the Consensus Penalty Structure).

Vote: 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: 6 (and 1 observing)
 1 letter grade reduction: 0
 Letter of Reprimand: 0
 Abstentions: 0

Vote: 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:	6 (and 1 observing)
1 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 both receive a 2 letter grade reduction. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to both their record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 1 hour

Respectfully submitted,

Allen Hu

Clerk