

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case #45-11, Fall 2015
9/17/15

Members Present:

Alex Metcalf (presiding), Emilia Duno (clerk), Meghana Pannala, Nick Conard, Natalie Swanson, Bradley Hamilton, Claire Bonnyman, Lanie Tubbs, Josiah Grace, Sara Meadow (observing)

Ombuds: Katie Jensen

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student O and Student S of giving/receiving unauthorized aid for a lower level COMP course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Class Syllabus
- Student O Written Statement
- Student S Written Statement

Plea:

Student O pled "In Violation."

Student S pled "In violation."

Testimony:

Student S states that he is in violation. It has been a long time and he doesn't remember sending the link and doesn't remember why he did. He never meant to violate the honor code but clearly did according to the evidence presented in the accusation.

Student O states he apologizes and hopes to regain trust that Rice placed in him. He claims that while he did receive the code he did not use any of it in writing his own code.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred.

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

Yes: 9 (1 observing)

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student O committed the violation.

The Council believed that Student O committed a violation based on the evidence and testimony of both students.

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

Yes: 9 (1 observing)

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student S committed the violation.

The Council believed that Student S committed a violation based on the evidence and testimony of both students.

Vote #3: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student S is “In Violation?”

Yes: 9 (1 observing)

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

Penalty Deliberations:

The council decided that both Student S and Student O should receive the same penalty, since giving and receiving unauthorized aid is treated the same under the Honor Code.

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances.

The Council discussed possibly mitigating for amount of the assignment because the Council was not presented with evidence regarding how much of the assignment was plagiarized. A council member decided it was unfair to make an assumption that their collaboration contributed to their codes, since the Council had evidence to indicate Student S sent code, which is cheating, but anything else is speculation. The Council then decided that the violation occurred in the action of sending and receiving of unauthorized aid, not in the amount of code that was shared.

No aggravating factors were seen.

Vote #6: What is the appropriate penalty for Student O and Student S?

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: 8 (1 observing)

1 letter grade reduction: 1

2/3 letter grade reduction: 0

1/3 letter grade reduction	0
Letter of Reprimand	0
Abstentions:	0

Decision:

The Honor Council thus finds Student O and Student S “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that they both receive a 2 letter grade reduction. A Prior Violation is also noted in their records.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 51 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Emilia Duno
Clerk