Abstract of the Honor Council  
Case 39, Spring 2014  
Monday, April 14th, 2014

Members Present:  
Hurst Williamson (presiding), Claire Bonnyman (clerk), Michael Jin, Destiney Randolph, Helen Sharpless, Sarah Frazier, Shayak Sengputa, Arroh Parikh, Julia Liu, Katie Jensen (observing), Jake Krauss (observing)

Ombuds: Jamie Smith

Letter of Accusation:  
The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of plagiarism on multiple homework sets for an upper level CAAM course.

Evidence Submitted:  
 Letter of Accusation  
 Student A’s Written Statement  
 Course Syllabus  
 Student A’s Homework  
 Homework Solutions  
 Student A’s Additional Homework Sets  
 Textbook Excerpt  
 MATLAB Code  
 Textedit Solutions

Plea:  
Student A pled “Not In Violation.”

Testimony:  
Student A passed out an outline of his testimony for clarity in which he refutes all accused accounts of plagiarism. He does not have access to last year’s solution and did all the homework independently. He used a notation that was used in past years and in the textbook because it is cleaner and can be used interchangeably with the other notation. He explained that similarities to past solutions happened because the students received an example code and were encouraged to study and review it. He used some results in a previous homework to solve problems in a later homework. From the way he wrote the code, MATLAB does not automatically indent. Student A provided examples of his homework in a lower level CAAM course to show repeated mistakes he has always made in his codes. He tested a code many times to make sure it was completely correct; this was a code that had two possible answers. Student A provided samples of his class notes to show times when he made careless errors or when something he wrote was unclear. Student A closed by emphasizing that he did all the homework by himself.
**Verdict Deliberations:**
Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation did not occur because Student A was very thorough and provided a valid explanation for each accusation.

Council members are on the fence as to whether or not a violation has occurred, some are leaning towards yes because there are one or two claims the professor made that the student could not adequately explain and some are leaning towards no because the student provided very thorough explanations and the questionable violations are minor, and evidence for them might be circumstantial. One question on a homework raised suspicion because it included components of the solutions from a past semester, but it also could have been an error independent of previous sections of the class.

Straw Poll #1: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred?
Yes: 0
No: 9 + 2 observing
Abstentions: 0

**Decision:**
The Honor Council thus finds Student A “Not In Violation” of the Honor Code.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 58 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Claire Bonnyman
Clerk