

**Abstract of the Honor Council****Case 5-4, Fall 2017****February 28<sup>th</sup>, 2018****Members Present:**

Reece Rosenthal (presiding), Stefano Romano (clerk), Mark Cantu, Sam Holloway, Ricky Robinson, James Suffoletta

**Ombuds:** Sam Morimoto

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Students A and B of unauthorized collaboration for a lower level COMP course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

**Evidence Submitted:**

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A and B's written statement
- Random code samples
- Reference code
- Full code comparison
- Supplementary evidence
- Project description
- Course syllabus

**Plea:**

Student A pled "Not In Violation." Student B pled "Not In Violation."

**Testimony:**

Student A started by stating that he and Student B worked in a group with a third student, within the bounds of the Honor Code, to complete this assignment. He then stated that, while they discussed class material, they did not discuss any particular functions in the assignment with the other students.

Student B stated that he did not commit his code early in the week because there is no incentive to do so. Student B then stated that there is only one way to do the majority of the assignment, so any similarities result from the small solution space for this particular assignment. He then stated that while he did discuss with Student A and a third student some concepts from the class, but did not discuss any particular part of the assignment. Student B then stated that he worked on this assignment in the same room as Student A and the third student for most of the assignment.

Student A closed by stating that the only similarity in his code with Student B was one comment, and that the comment is not relevant to the graded code. He then reiterated that he did not violate the Honor Code in discussing concepts with Student B.

Student B closed by stating that the project guidelines required all solutions to be similar, so any similarities between Student B and Student A's code are a result of this.

### **Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because both students had extremely similar code, and both students admitted to discussing topics directly related to the assignment while having their code out.

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 Students A and B committed the violation. The Council saw no reason why Students A and B did not commit 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. The Council saw no reason to mitigate. The CPS penalty for this case, based on the weight of the assignment, is a 1 letter grade reduction. The Council thought that a 1 letter grade reduction was the appropriate penalty for this violation.

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 Students A and B “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that they both receive a 1 letter grade reduction.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 35 minutes

Respectfully submitted,  
Stefano Romano  
Clerk