Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 13, Fall 2017
February 19, 2018

Members Present:
Reece Rosenthal (presiding), Grant Wilkinson (clerk), Sam Holloway, Amy Lin, Jacob Kesten, Stefano Romano

Ombuds: Carey Wang

Letter of Accusation:
The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of using unauthorized online resources during a take home midterm as well as collaborating excessively on a pledged problem for a lower level CAAM course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:
- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Student Exam
- Student Pledge Problem
- Exam Prompts
- Pledge Problem Prompt
- Syllabus
- Random Exam 1 Sample
- Professor Clarification
- Webpage

Plea:
Student A pled "Not in violation."

Testimony:
Opening Statement:
In the student's opening statement in response to the exam, he stated that the reason the answer was so similar is that his high school computer class covered the material that was supposed to have been cheated on. That is why his answer is so similar to the online resource.

In response to the pledged lab accusation, he said that he did the lab himself but it was still at a point in the class where he felt comfortable with the material and that is why that pledged was so good versus his later pledged labs.

Questioning:
The student said that there was no copying of code from his high school classes about Horner's Algorithm. The majority of the high school computer science class was not done in MatLab but the portion about Horner's Algorithm probably was. He could not

say whether remember whether he had seen the webpage before. The reason he used "a" instead of "c" as a variable was just that it came to mind first. The allowed online resources were those posted to Canvas and other previous projects.

The latency between the date of the assignment and the date of the accusation seemed malicious.

Closing Statement:
The student said that the accuser might have been making the accusation due to external circumstances.

Horner's Theorem was used before in AP Computer Science so that was why the exam and the online source were so similar. The pledged problem was done by him alone.

Verdict Deliberations:
Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred with regard to the exam because the code in the students exam and the code in the website is identical down to the non-functional parts of the code. Additionally, the use of "a" instead of "c" is another sign that the exam was cheated on.

The consensus was that the pledged lab cannot be considered due to lack of any 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 committed the violation. The Council agreed that 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 and aggravating circumstances. No mitigating or aggravating factors were seen by the Council members.

The CPS penalty for this case, based on the weight of the assignment, is a one-letter grade reduction.

Vote #3: 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

Decision:
The Honor Council thus finds Student A "In Violation" of the Honor Code and recommends that he receive a one letter grade reduction.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 40 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Grant Wilkinson
Clerk