

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 24, Spring 2018
April 24th, 2018

Members Present:

Grant Wilkinson (presiding), Stefano Romano (clerk), Saniya Gayake, Maheen Khizar, Mark Cantu, Virginia Xie

Ombuds: Oeishi Banerjee

Letter of Accusation:

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

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Course syllabus
- Assignment prompt
- Student A's assignment
- Student B's assignment
- Assignment weight clarification

Plea:

Student A pled "In Violation." Student B pled "In Violation."

Testimony:

Student A started by stating that she assisted Student B with this assignment when Student B asked Student A for help. Student A stated that no copying or pasting of code took place between the two students. Student A then stated that Student B transcribed her code from Student A.

Student B started by stating that she is in violation of the Honor Code for this course. She stated that code was never sent before the two students, but that the two students sat down side-by-side to work on the code. Student B then also stated that she committed an Honor Code violation on another pledged assignment in the course, and asked that the Council give her an appropriate sanction for both pledged assignments.

Student A closed by stating that she will not commit an Honor Code violation in the future.

Student B closed by stating that she is extremely remorseful for committing this Honor Code violation. She then reiterated that she committed an Honor Code violation on the second pledged assignment for the course, and said that the Council should consider that assignment In Violation as well in penalty deliberations.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because both students pled “In Violation”, as well as the fact that the two students’ assignments were extremely similar.

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 decided to mitigate for substantial disclosure for Student B, due to the fact that the Council would not have considered her other assignment “In Violation” had she not brought it up in verbal testimony.

The CPS penalty for this case, for Student A, based on the weight of the assignment, is a 2 letter grade reduction.

The CPS penalty for this case, for Student B, considering both pledged assignments, is an F in the course. Council members then mitigated down to a 3 letter grade reduction for Student B for substantial disclosure.

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: 6
1 letter grade reduction: 0

Letter of Reprimand	0
Abstentions:	0

Vote #6: 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:	4
2 letter grade reduction:	2
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 a 2 letter grade reduction.

The Honor Council thus finds Student B “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that she receive a 3 letter grade reduction.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 1 hour

Respectfully submitted,
Stefano Romano
Clerk