

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 1-5, Fall 2018
10/29/18

Members Present:

Matt Nobles (presiding), Amy Lin (clerk), Virginia Xie, Matey Yanakiev, Sam Holloway, Joy Wang, Angela Liu (observing)

Ombuds: Laura Li, Jean Choi (observing)

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A, B, C, and D of collaborating on a pledged assignment for a lower level CAAM 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
- Student C's written statement
- Student D's written statement
- Student A's code
- Student B's code
- Student C's code
- Student D's code
- Random student samples
- Assignment instructions
- Assignment addendum
- Relevant class slides
- Class syllabus
- Accuser's notes

Plea:

Student A pled "in violation."

Student B pled "in violation."

Student C pled "in violation."

Student D pled "in violation."

Testimony:

Student A collaborated first with Student C, working side by side. He then asked for help from Student D on a function. He then relayed the help he received from Student D to Student C. Student A did not work with Student B.

Student B received help from Student D by looking directly at Student D's code and copying the structure of Student D's completed code. Student B did not work with Student A or Student C.

Student C collaborated with Student A, discussing side by side how to implement the code. Student C did not work with Student B or Student D.

Student D first did the assignment by himself and submitted it. Student A then asked Student D for help on a function, so Student D explained how to write the code. Student D then left his laptop out for Student A and Student B, telling them that they could look at his code if they were not sure how to finish the assignment. Student D did not work with Student C.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because many lines of code were the exact same or had the same structure with renamed variables. In addition, the students' testimonies supported that collaboration occurred.

Vote #1: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred?

Yes: 6+1

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A, Student B, Student C, and Student D committed the violation. Because all students had similarity in their assignments and all admitted to collaborating, the Council saw no reason to not find all students in violation.

Vote #2: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student A, Student B, Student C, and Student D are "In Violation?"

Yes: 6+1

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

Penalty Deliberations:

Council members opened by discussing mitigating or aggravating circumstances. The Council saw no reason to mitigate or aggravate.

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

Vote #3: What is the appropriate penalty for Student A, Student B, Student C, and Student D?

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

1 letter grade reduction:	0
Letter of Reprimand	0
Abstentions:	0

Decision:

The Honor Council thus finds Student A, Student B, Student C, and Student D “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that all receive a 2 letter grade reduction.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 50 min

Respectfully submitted,
Amy Lin
Clerk