

**Abstract of the Honor Council  
Case #4-5, Fall 2017  
February 27, 2018**

**Members Present:**

Reece Rosenthal (presiding), Grant Wilkinson (clerk), Virginia Xie, Ricky Robinson, Stefano Romano, Siddharth Gorantla

**Ombuds:** Laura Li

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B in excessive collaboration 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
- Student B's Written Statement
- Full Code Link
- Supplementary Evidence
- Syllabus
- Course Reference Code
- Sample Code
- Selected References
- Student Submitted Evidence

**Plea:**

Student A pled "In Violation."

Student B pled "In Violation."

**Testimony:**

Student A Testimony:

His project 6 was his individual work except for his `makeArrayList` function. Their similarity in the test code as well as the json code is due to suggestions made in the project prompt and reference code given by the professor. The reference code was explicitly stated to be okay to use and since both students used the reference code, their codes for that portion look very similar to one another. The student was traveling near the times of the project being due and the reason they have only one commit is because they did not have internet access during the time he was traveling. Additionally, the only part of the assignment that was copied was the `makeArrayList` function. The rest of the assignment was done individually. He only copied one out of nine functions.

Student B Testimony:

The two students decided to collaborate on the makeArrayList function during their time on recess. Student A copied Student B's makeArrayList directly from his computer screen. All other functions were done independently.

### **Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because both students have admitted to viewing each other's code and the evidence shows two very similar codes, suggesting excessive collaboration.

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 and Student B committed the 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: 6

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

### **Penalty Deliberations:**

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. No mitigating or aggravating factors were seen.

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

The Honor Council thus finds Student B “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