Abstract of the Honor Council  
Case 40, Spring 2014  
April 9, 2014

Members Present:  
Hurst Williamson (presiding), Shantan Cheemerla (clerk), Michael Jin, Adriana Bracho,  
Avni Shah, Komal Agarwal, Luke Van Der Spoel, Mario Aragon, Katie Stewart, Destiny  
Randolph (observing), Nicolas Conard (observing)

Ombuds: Jayme Smith

Letter of Accusation:  
The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of using unauthorized aid on  
homeworks for a UPPER level CAAM course.

Evidence Submitted:
 Letter of Accusation  
 Student A’s written statement  
 Course Syllabus  
 TA Statement  
 Student A’s Homeworks  
 Homework Solutions

Plea:  
Student A pled “NOT IN VIOLATION.”

Testimony:  
The student asserted that she did all the homeworks by herself. The student claimed to  
not have seen the solutions from the previous semester while working on the homeworks.  
The student did have access to code made accessible by the professor. The TA of the  
course helped with the homeworks, but did not distribute or help with the code. The TA  
told the student the steps necessary to solve the question and sometimes the structure of  
the solution without getting into the specifics of the code. The student said that the TA’s  
help was used on 50-60% of the homework. The student did not collaborate with any  
other students to complete the homework. The student said that she did not indent in her  
code because of personal preference and that the lack of indentation did not indicate  
copying. The student stated that she only indented when the code had 3 or more loops,  
but in short paragraphs of code she did not feel the need to indent. There were 50  
homework assignments in the course.

Verdict Deliberations:  
Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence does NOT support that a  
violation occurred.
Council members noted that the code might be similar, but significant differences existed between the student’s homework and the previous semester’s solutions. Members noted that the student received a lot of help from the TA that might have caused the student’s solution to be accomplished with the same methodology and logic as the professor’s solution. Members noted that while the lack of indentation seems odd, the code was not dissimilar enough to say that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation had occurred.

Vote #1: 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 “Not In Violation” of the Honor Code.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 20 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Shantan Cheemerla
Clerk