

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 1, Fall 2019
10/29/19

Members Present:

Amy Lin (presiding), Ricky Robinson (clerk), Kyler Foutch, Mark Cantu, Abrar Mamun, Syed Shams, Adam Zawierucha (observing), Nicole Lhuillier (observing)

Ombuds: Clay Siminiski

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of publishing code publicly online 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 1
- Student A's Written Statement 2
- Course Syllabus
- OIT Logs
- Professor Clarification
- Professor Point Clarification
- TA 1 Statement
- TA 2 Statement 1
- TA 2 Statement 2
- Screenshot of Google search results
- Screenshot of code found online

Plea:

Student A pled "not in violation."

Testimony:

Student A described the circumstances surrounding the accusation. He admitted to uploading his code to this website, although he was unaware that it was made public. The purpose of uploading the code was to get help from a former student in the course. Student A concluded that he had no intention to help any other student cheat, and the public posting of the code was not an intentional violation of the Honor Code. Rather, he misunderstood how the website worked and did not realize it would be public.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the student made his code available to the public and accessible by Google, which explicitly violates the course's Honor Code. While the student did not copy code from another source, he still committed an Honor Code

violation because the course syllabus stated that any public posting of code from the course was not allowed.

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. The Council found no reason to believe that Student A was not in 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. The Council did not see a reason to mitigate, as the entire assignment was posted online. The Council found no reason to aggravate.

The CPS penalty for this case, based on the weight of the assignment, is a 1 letter grade reduction.

Vote #3: 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: 0

2 letter grade reduction: 0

1 letter grade reduction: 4+1 observing

Letter of Reprimand 2

Abstentions: 1 observing

The Council discussed whether the weight of the assignment was small enough to warrant a Letter of Reprimand rather than a 1 letter grade reduction. Ultimately, the Council decided that while the percentage was small, it still fell within the “under 5%” category. The nature of the case did not provide a reason to mitigate down to a Letter of Reprimand.

Decision:

The Honor Council thus finds Student A “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that he receive a 1 letter grade reduction.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 55 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Ricky Robinson
Clerk