

**Abstract of the Honor Council**  
**Case 34, Spring 2017**  
**5/6/17**

**Members Present:**

Reece Rosenthal (presiding), Alex Metcalf (clerk), Siddharth Gorantla, Ryan Carlson, Ike Arjmand, Claire Bonnyman

**Ombuds:** Colin Losey

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing both students of plagiarizing from a previous assignment for an upper 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
- Student project
- Previous project
- Syllabus
- Lab instructions
- Professor clarification

**Plea:**

Student A pled "In Violation"

Student B pled "Not In Violation"

**Testimony:**

Student A stated that she had downloaded the code to access it, but stated that Student B was unaware that the code was used to complete the assignment. She stated that Student B had nothing to do with the code usage, and that her violation was not plagiarism, but just access. Student A stated that she previously admitted to using old code on another assignment.

During questioning, Student A agreed that she submitted code someone else wrote. Student A also stated that she was not aware she submitted the code of another student. According to Student A, she submitted code at least two times.

Student B stated that she did not use any code she was not supposed to, and was not aware that Student A submitted the code of another student.

During questioning, Student B explained that the students intended to work on it separately, but began to combine code about a week before the code was due. Student B stated that she was not aware where the code provided by Student A came from.

Student A walked the Council through various code segments, and stated that she accessed the code of other students because she “didn’t think it would be that big of a deal”, before reiterating that Student B was not responsible for the plagiarized code.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the student testimony agrees with the evidence submitted.

Vote #1: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred?

Yes: 6

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether each student committed a violation.

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: 0

No: 6

Abstentions: 0

**Penalty Deliberations:**

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. The Council agreed that Student A did provide valuable information about the role of Student B in the project, and mitigated slightly.

Some Council members decided to aggravate for involving another student.

Additionally, Student A received a previous violation in this class, for accessing the code of another student.

The CPS penalty for this case, based on the weight of the assignment, is an F in the course.

Some Council members decided that an F was appropriate, while others believed an F in the course and a one semester suspension was the correct penalty. Discussion ranged around the magnitude of mitigation and aggravation, especially given the student’s previous violation.

Vote #5: 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:	4
F in the course:	2
3 letter grade reduction:	0
2 letter grade reduction:	0
1 letter grade reduction:	0
Letter of Reprimand	0
Abstentions:	0

**Decision:**

The Honor Council thus finds Student A “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that she receive an F in the course and 1 semester of suspension.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 45 minutes

Respectfully submitted,  
Alex Metcalf  
Clerk