

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 41, Spring 2017
1 Dec. 2017

Members Present:

Reece Rosenthal (presiding), Ike Arjmand (clerk), Mark Cantu, Jacob Kesten, Maheen Khizar, Amy Lin

Ombuds: Colin Losey

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of multiple submission and of using unauthorized course materials from prior semesters for 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
- The course syllabus
- The assignment prompts
- Student A's assignments
- The solutions to the assignments

Plea:

Student A pled "Not in Violation."

Testimony:

The student stated that he had taken the course previously. He said that he then re-enrolled in the course before dropping it. He stated that similarities in the assignments he submitted in different semesters resulted from thinking similarly to how he had in the past, and that he did not look at his work from the prior semester when writing his assignment.

Regarding the similarities between his code and the TA solution code, he stated that they stemmed from code students were given in class and were allowed to use on the homework. The student also stated that he did not have access to the TA solutions and that there would be no way to access them.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the student's submissions between the two semesters were identical in certain areas. Specifically, the written versions contained several exactly identical sentences. The Council discussed the similarity between the coding portions of assignments and the TA solutions, and determined that the coding portions of the assignments were not in violation.

Vote: 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, and determined that he had, based on the similarities in the written assignment.

Vote: 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. Council members did not consider any mitigating circumstances.

Council members then discussed aggravating circumstances. Given that the student had previously been found in violation of the Honor Code in the same course, Council members aggravated. Council members focused on the seriousness of having multiple violations in the same course.

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

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: 6

3 letter grade reduction: 0

2 letter grade reduction: 0

1 letter grade reduction: 0

Letter of Reprimand 0

Abstentions: 0

Because of the student’s previous violation in the same course, Council members aggravated to an F in the course.

Decision:

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

Time of testimony and deliberations: 1 hour 53 minutes

Respectfully submitted,

Ike Arjmand
Clerk