Abstract of the Honor Council  
Case 43, Spring 2014  
April 1, 2014

Members Present:  
Hurst Williamson (presiding), Sam Kwiatkowski (clerk), Allen Hu, Cesar Udave, Luke Van Der Spoel, Michael Williams-Hart, Lynn Fahey, Aaroh Parikh, Ibrahim Akbar, Komal Agrawal

Ombuds:

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

Evidence Submitted:
- Letter of Accusation
- Student A’s written statement
- Homeworks and solution manuals given by the Richard Rankin

Plea:
Student A pled “Not in violation”

Testimony:
Student A stated that many of the concerns described in the accusation letter were purely coincidental. This included the order of the legends, and the used of certain MATLAB expressions, which were previously known to the student. The student received help on homework assignments during the professor’s office hours, from TA’s, and from friends. These events helped the student with concepts, but did not cause him to use the solutions manual in question.

Verdict Deliberations:
Many council members expressed that they felt that the evidence did not show an obvious violation occurred. Some aspects of the homework were suspiciously similar to the solution, but still make sense logically, for example, the way the graphs are presented.

Straw Poll #1: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred?
Yes: 0
No: 8 (plus 1 observing member)
Abstentions: 1

Abstaining member thinks the accused student’s testimony does not fully address the suspicious aspects of the assignment.
Straw Poll #2: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred?
Yes: 0
No: 8 (plus 1 observing member)
Abstentions: 0

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

Time of testimony and deliberations: 40 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Sam Kwiatkowski
Clerk