

**Abstract of the Honor Council**  
**Case 17-5, Fall 2020**  
**March 5, 2021**

**Members Present:**

Kaitlyn Crowley (presiding), Hannah Dryer (clerk), Zac Zalles, Mark Cantu, Izzi Reynolds, Rodolfo Gutierrez-Garcia, Izzie Karohl (observing), Sam Holloway (observing)

**Ombuds:** Grace Nichols, Eliot Behr (observing)

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A, Student B, and Student C of copying on two assignments for a lower level CAAM course (Students B and C took the Alternative Resolution). The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

**Evidence Submitted:**

- Letter of Accusation (x2)
- Assignment descriptions (x2)
- Student A's written statement
- Student B's written statement
- Student C's written statement
- Student A's code for both assignments
- Student B's code for both assignments
- Student C's code for both assignments
- RLA statements (x2)
- Professor statement
- Relevant lecture slides
- Random student sample code
- Course syllabus

**Plea:**

Student A pled "Not in Violation."

**Testimony:**

Student A worked with both Student B and C on Assignment 1 and collaborated within the confines of the Honor Code and the course syllabus. The students talked to one another about the assignment and shared information they had gotten from going to office hours separately and from their RLA's. They never shared their code directly with one another; most of their communication was helping each other solve issues in their code. Student A also went to office hours with the professor and got help from the academic fellows in his residential college. The RLA stated that although the code was similar between the students, the comments were different and the students were allowed to collaborate.

Student A stated that he did not work with Student B or C on Assignment 2, as collaboration was not allowed on this assignment. Student A was at home during this assignment, so he could not have worked in person with the other students as they usually would when collaboration was allowed. For this assignment, Student A went to the professor's office hours and received a lot of help with his code. The professor helped with the code itself as well as the structuring of it. Student A showed the Council several areas in his code where the professor helped him, and also showed the Council where he got some of his comments from the assignment description. Student B had also gone to the professor's office hours, so it is possible that their codes were similar because the professor had helped them both significantly.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

For Assignment 1, Council members did not see any proof of unauthorized collaboration between the students. Student A had his own unique comments and although the code was similar, a preponderance of the evidence supported that the similarities arose from authorized collaboration.

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

Yes: 0  
 No: 6  
 Abstentions: 0

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred for Assignment 2 because Student A and Student B had extremely similar code structures and comments. Some of the comments were identical between the students. The Council did not see any comments with that degree of similarity in the random student sample codes. The preponderance of the evidence supports that these similarities occurred due to collaboration, and collaboration was not allowed on this assignment.

Vote #2: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred for Assignment 2?

Yes: 6  
 No: 0  
 Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A committed the violation. The preponderance of the evidence suggested that Student A was responsible for the violation.

Vote #3: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student A is "In Violation?"

Yes: 6  
 No: 0  
 Abstentions: 0

**Penalty Deliberations:**

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. The Council decided that there were neither mitigating nor aggravating factors present.

The CPS penalty for this case, based on the weight of the assignment, is a 3 letter grade reduction in the course.

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

In the absence of mitigating or aggravating factors, the Council agreed with the CPS-assigned penalty for this case.

**Decision:**

The Honor Council thus finds Student A “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that he receive a 3 letter grade reduction in the course.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 60 minutes

Respectfully submitted,  
Hannah Dryer  
Clerk