

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 23-1, Spring 2019
10/10/19

Members Present:

Sam Holloway (presiding), Caroline Brehm (clerk), Mark Cantu, Hannah Dryer, Ricky Robinson, Izzie Karohl, Abrar Mamun (observing), Kaitlyn Crowley (observing)

Ombuds: Pierson Lund

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of plagiarizing two 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 written statement
- Student A's submissions
- Project descriptions
- Random student samples
- Class syllabus
- Relevant class slides
- MATLAB files from lecture

Plea:

Student A pled "in violation."

Testimony:

Student A began his statement by admitting to violating the Honor Code. He said that he copied code from a student in a previous semester without the other student's knowledge. He also admitted to sharing the previous student's code with another student in the course. The student concluded by apologizing for breaking the Honor Code.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred due to Student A's testimony and the existing material evidence.

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

Yes: 6+2

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A committed the violation. Since Student A admitted to copying the code, the Council concluded that he was responsible for the violation.

Vote #2: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student A is “In Violation?”

Yes: 6+2

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

Penalty Deliberations:

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. Since Student A admitted to copying code from a previous student without their knowledge, the Council entered into a discussion of whether or not the violation was considered heinous.

Vote #3: Does the council consider the violation heinous?

Yes: 0

No: 6+2

Abstentions: 0

The Council determined that since the previous student provided unfettered access of his code to Student A, the violation should not be considered heinous. The Council also decided that because there was no student subjected unnecessarily to the Honor Council process, the violation did not constitute a heinous violation.

The CPS penalty for this case, based on the weight of the assignment, is a 3-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: 6+2

2 letter grade reduction: 0

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 he receive a 3-letter grade reduction.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 35 minutes

Respectfully submitted,

Caroline Brehm

Clerk