Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 6, Fall 2013
November 20, 2013

Members Present:
Adriana Bracho (presiding), Katie Stewart (clerk), Seth Lauer, Hurst Williamson,
Michael Farner, Aaroh Parikh, Michael Jin, Josiah Grace, John Cavallo, Chloe Tula
(Observing), Avani Shah (Observing), Jake Hassel (Observing)

Ombuds: Sarah Frazier

Letter of Accusation:
The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of unauthorized
collaboration for a graduate level Computer Science course.

Evidence Submitted:
- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Student B's written statement
- Course Syllabus
- Homework 4 Prompt
- Student A Ball Code
- Student B Ball Code
- Expert Deposition 1
- Expert Deposition 2
- Documentation Homework 4
- Homework 3 for both students
- Homework 3 prompt

Plea:
Student A pled "Not in Violation."
Student B pled "Not in Violation."

Testimony:

Student A went through and explained her code in defense of the accusation. Homework
4 is the fourth of a series of five in the Ball homework, which explains how she chose to
name her first variables. Each homework assignment in the series is evolved from the
previous homework. She mentioned she automatically generated getters/setters from
Eclipse. The reason for the same names of setters/getters between Student A and Student
B is because the names of the variables are the same. New names for the additional
variables are generated from document provided to the class. Student A stated that it is
very likely that variable names will be similar to other students' variable names. It is
Student A's opinion that the code overall is actually quite different.

Student A read through the first expert deposition that pointed out the differences between the codes. Student A testified that she did not know Student B prior to the accusation.

Student A explained that variables without underscores are inherited from Homework 3, but Homework 3 does not have all the same strategies. Homework 4 added a new strategy and in order to distinguish the strategies, an underscore was used, as according to the documentation provided by the professor. After seeing what the professor used, Student A decided to use the underscore.

Student A worked on the assignment typically at night in her dorm, with no more than 2 nights of work for the assignment.

Student B explained that Homework 4 was a part of a series and that variables in Homework 4 were adapted from Homework 3. Student B demonstrated for the Council on Eclipse how to generate getter and setters and why some methods names mix camel and snake case and why others do not. Student B worked on the homework assignment in her dormitory.

Student A further explained the complexity and difference between their codes. In closing, Student A certifies that she neither gave nor received unauthorized aid on the assignment and that the code similarities are not out of the ordinary and do not indicate an honor code violation.

Student B states that since there were more thirty files in the entire assignment, a single file is not an indication of a violation. She ended by saying that she did not violate the Honor Code.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members did not believe that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred the suspicious mixes between snake and camel case mentioned in the accusation letter were thoroughly explained both through the testimony of the students and corroborated by expert depositions. Otherwise, the approaches to the code were seen as different.

Vote: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred?
Yes: 0
No: 9
Abstentions: 0

Decision:
The Honor Council thus finds Student A and Student B "Not In Violation" of the Honor Code.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 46 minutes.

Respectfully submitted,
Katie Stewart
Clerk