

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 22, Spring 2018
4/13/18

Members Present:

Matt Nobles (presiding), Amy Lin (clerk), Maheen Khizar, Peter Rizzi, Talia Kramer, Siddharth Gorantla, Sree Yeluri

Ombuds: Pierson Lund

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of submitting identical projects for a lower level CAAM course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's project submission
- Student B's project submission
- TA 1 written statement
- TA 1 Powerpoint slides
- TA 2 written statement
- TA 2 Powerpoint slides
- Project description
- Course syllabus

Plea:

Student A pled "in violation."

Student B pled "not in violation."

Testimony:

Student A admitted that they worked together on the assignment. She pointed out that the syllabus encouraged students to collaborate, so their work together may have been permitted by the class policy. She worked closely with a tutor throughout the course on projects, which was approved by the TA, but she had never expressly asked the professor for permission.

Student B stated that she did collaborate with Student A. They shared different parts of the project that they had worked on in separate study groups. In addition, they received a significant amount of code from the TA session, which led to similar project submissions. They used the same variable names so that it would be easier to talk about different parts of the project.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because their code was identical, which is prohibited on the syllabus.

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. Because the project submissions were identical, there was no reason not to believe that Student A committed the violation.

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. Because the project submissions were identical, there was no reason not to believe that Student B committed the violation.

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 and aggravating circumstances. They found no reason to mitigate or aggravate.

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 she receive a 1 letter grade reduction.

The Honor Council thus finds Student B “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that she receive a 1 letter grade reduction.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 50 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Amy Lin
Clerk