

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case #12, Fall 2015
12 December 2015

Members Present:

Alex Metcalf (presiding), Emilia Duno (clerk), Destiney Randolph, Natalie Swanson, Billy Rothwell, Allie Salter, Elliot Baerman, Anika Zaman, Meghana Panala

Ombuds: Carey Wong

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A, B, C and D of plagiarism for a lower level COMP 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
- COMP 321 assignment
- Email Screenshot
- Assignment Overview ▪ Class Syllabus
- Student A's code
- Student B's code
- Student C's code
- Student D's code

Plea:

Student A pled "Not in Violation."

Student B pled "Not in Violation."

Student C pled "In Violation."

Student D pled "In Violation."

Testimony:

Student A stated that she and Student D were in the same group and they finished half of the assignment together. After she had completed her share of the work, the student had no idea of what was done with the assignment. It was not until she received the letter of accusation that she was made aware of a possible violation. She stated that she was not aware of the transmission of the code nor did she participate in the violation that took

place. She also stated that the code submitted was her own, so she did not believe that she was in violation.

In her closing statement she reiterated that she was not in violation, as she did not participate, had no knowledge of the violation and the assignment she submitted was 100% her own.

Student B explained for this assignment she did the report part of the assignment and wrote about the code that Student C sent to her. Her work described the algorithms, code and general structure of the code. As Student C was in charge of the coding part of the assignment, she didn't know there was a violation in the code.

When asked when she received the code to write the report on she answered that she received the code very close to the deadline of the assignment.

In her closing statement she reiterated that she just handled the report part of the assignment and was not aware of the violation that took place.

Student C stated that her partner was not very contributing to the assignment at all and became very stressed as she was doing all the work himself. As the due date was approaching and she was running out of time, she reached out to Student D for help. Student C stated that Student D was helpful and willing to help her with a lot of parts of the coding, and once she realized she would not be able to finish in time she asked for Student D's code. She reiterated that this was a last minute decision to catch up. In her closing statement she reiterated that she provided helpful evidence, didn't mean to violate the Honor Code and thanked the Council for their time.

Student D explained this was a group assignment and she and Student A were partners and they completed the assignment together. The day before the assignment was due, Student C came to him and said she had an emergency. Since Student C had to deal with it, she had no time to complete her work. Student D stated that she provided significant help on the assignment and she didn't want to give Student C her code. However, according to Student D, Student C said that she needed help and had no time so in the end Student D sent him the code. Student D stated that she didn't know Student C would copy it instead of using it as a reference.

In her closing statement she reiterated that she sent Student C her code and she feels regretful and acknowledges that she shouldn't have done it.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the evidence and the testimony of the students supported the accusation.

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

Yes: 9

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed which specific students committed the violation. Since the only evidence of directionality was given by the student testimony, and the testimony of each student portrayed the same narrative, the Council used the testimony to determine which students were “In Violation”.

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

Yes: 0

No: 9

Abstentions: 0

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

Yes: 0

No: 9

Abstentions: 0

Vote #4: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student C is “In Violation?”

Yes: 9

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

Vote #5: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student D is “In Violation?”

Yes: 9

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

Penalty Deliberations:

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. The assignment was a significant amount of the course grade, so there was no mitigation for amount or weight.

The Council decided that both students found “In Violation” should receive the same penalty.

Vote #6: What is the appropriate penalty for Students C and 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:	9
2 letter grade reduction:	0
1 letter grade reduction:	0
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 C and D “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that they receive a three letter grade reduction.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 1:15

Respectfully submitted,
Emilia Duno
Clerk