

**Abstract of the Honor Council**  
**Case 17-2, Fall 2017**  
**February 20, 2018**

**Members Present:**

Reece Rosenthal (presiding), Maheen Khizar (clerk), Grant Wilkinson, Bella Bunten, Rohit Chouhan, James Suffoletta

**Ombuds:** Clay Siminski, Kenton Whitmire (observing)

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of excessive collaboration on a lower level COMP 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
- Sample Code A
- Sample Code B
- Project Description
- Full Code
- Course Syllabus
- Supplementary Evidence

**Plea:**

Student A pled "in violation."

Student B pled "in violation."

**Testimony:**

Student A stated that he believes structural similarities are largely due to the being taught the same methods of structuring in the course. Student A stated that some similarities in code can be attributed to receiving similar advice from the same TA. Student A stated that the 3-line helper function is in violation of the Honor Code, adding that he is personally unsure as to whether this is in really a violation.

Student B stated that Javadoc similarities are due to derivation from the same reference code provided by the instructor. Student B stated that stylistic similarity can be attributed to the few stylistic possibilities in implementing the course, that structural similarities can be attributed to the similar ways of being taught in the course, and that other similarities can be attributed to receiving the same advice from a course TA. Student B stated that there was verbal collaboration and that the collaboration regarding implementation of

helper function went beyond the means provided by the course syllabus honor code policy.

### **Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the level of collaboration was beyond that specified as allowable in the syllabus, as exemplified by student testimonies and provided 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 found Student B to be in violation due to the evidence provided.

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

Yes: 6

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student B committed the violation. The Council found Student A to be in violation due to the evidence provided.

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. Discussion ensued regarding whether mitigation was appropriate for the amount of assignment that is demonstrably not in violation. The council found that as a portion of the assignment was vital to the assignment’s working status, the entire assignment should be considered to be in violation. Students’ disclosure was found to be non-substantial, as the council would have come to the conclusion it did even without the students’ disclosure.

Council members discussed aggravating circumstances and found none appropriate to the case at hand.

The CPS penalty for this case, based on the weight of the assignment, is a 1 letter grade reduction.

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 “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that he receive 1 letter recommendation. The Honor Council thus finds Student B “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that he receive 1 letter recommendation.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 45 minutes

Respectfully submitted,  
Maheen Khizar  
Clerk