Danger Days:
An Honor Council Academic Case
Released Fall 2019

This abstract was released in accordance to the timeline specified by the Students’ Association Constitution. The confronting party consented to the release of the abstract. The confronted party did not consent to the release of the abstract.

Key:
Confronted Party: Kobra Kid
Confronting Party: Professor Dr. Death Defying
Course: Infiltrating BL/ind 101

Summary:
This case was reviewed by Honor Council and dropped instead of being sent to trial. Although Honor Council believed that a violation had occurred, they decided that the trial goals of education, accountability, and restoration had already been met. Furthermore, Council did not feel that they were the appropriate body to provide resources that would be mutually beneficial for Kobra Kid and Professor Dr. Death Defying.

In his statement, Kobra Kid explained that there were personal issues that had caused him to fall behind on his assignments for Infiltrating BL/ind 101. Professor Dr. Death Defying gave Kobra Kid extensions for all of the incomplete assignments, to be completed by the end of the semester. However, in completing these assignments, Kobra Kid consulted the partial solutions posted on Moodle to guide his thought process. He then used the full solutions to edit and correct his assignments. Professor Dr. Death Defying considered this plagiarism of his solutions, and confronted Kobra Kid. Upon confrontation, Kobra Kid realized that his actions were a violation of the Code, but he expressed that in the moment of his violation he was not thinking about the Code, nor how using the posted solutions could be a violation. He also expressed that he was uncertain about the expectations for the course. He was only focused on receiving good enough grades to avoid a forced leave from the College.

Council Deliberations:
Council agreed that they were suspicious of a violation. However, Council also felt that the trial goals of restoration and accountability had already been met because Kobra Kid would fail the course regardless of his grades for these assignments. A Council member also voiced concerns that the drawn-out structure of the trial process would not be beneficial to any of the
parties involved. In light of this, even though Council was not completely satisfied that the trial goal of education had been met, Council considered dropping the case with some recommendations focusing on education. Drafting recommendations took a significant amount of time, during which Council continued to deliberate on whether or not to send the case to trial. Council consented to drop the case with the following recommendations, purposefully leaving them flexible so that they could be as beneficial as possible to Kobra Kid.

**Recommendations:**

1. *Honor Council recommends that [Kobra Kid] has a conversation with [Professor Dr. Death Defying], mediated by a member of Honor Council. The conversation could focus on: why this situation happened in the first place, how communication between professors and students can be improved, and how this situation can be avoided in the future.*

2. *Honor Council also recommends that [Kobra Kid] continue to meet with their Dean to discuss the circumstances surrounding this incident and connect with appropriate resources to address the issue.*

*On dropping the case with the above recommendations: 14 consent, 1 stands outside, 1 stands outside in absentia*

**Discussion Questions:**

1. Should this case have been sent to trial? Why or why not?
2. Are the current options for handling a case insufficient? Are there better alternatives?
3. In situations involving potential Honor Code violations of significant assignments like midterms, should a case always be sent to trial?
4. What are ways to meet the trial goal of accountability beyond a grade change?