

**Abstract of the Honor Council**  
**Case 45-18, Fall 2014**  
**December 6<sup>th</sup>, 2015**

**Members Present:**

Alex Metcalf (presiding), Bradley Hamilton (clerk), Claire Bonnyman, Allie Salter, Reece Rosenthal, Meghana Pannala, Emilia Duno, Kristin Sweeney, Destiney Randolph

**Ombuds:** Katie Jensen

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student Z and Student AB of unauthorized collaboration for a lower level COMP course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

**Evidence Submitted:**

- Letter of Accusation
- Student Z's written statement
- Student AB's written statement
- Professor MOSS Clarification
- Stratocode Timing
- Course Syllabus

**Plea:**

Student AB pled "Not in Violation."

**Testimony:**

As the case was more than a year ago, Student AB stated that he did not have full memory of the events. Student AB said he started writing the codes on stratocode but eventually moved to writing the code in eclipse. After this, the accused explained that he sent clone links of the code to himself to have easy access to them. Student AB was unable to run his code on his own computer, which caused him to use Student Z's computer in order to test his code. In order to do this, the accused had to open the cloned link from his own email, but did not notice that Student Z was logged in on stratocode. When the browser opened, it opened in Student Z's account. It was common practice within the class to store codes within Stratocode by using clone links, but running the codes on a different platform.

Student AB addressed the fact that he often deleted clone links that he sent to himself and therefore does not have access to the records of sending the clone link to himself. In addition to this, Student AB believes that sharing a laptop does not count as an Honor Code violation because no code was shared between the students.

**Plea:**

Student Z pled “Not in violation”

**Testimony:**

Student AB asked to borrow Student Z’s laptop in order to run test cases because the environment on Student Z’s laptop was working better than Student AB’s laptop. When doing this, all of the code that Student AB tested was created by Student AB. In addition to this, Student Z does not remember receiving the clone links created and used by student AB. Student Z then stated that students are not allowed to see each other’s code and Student AB deleted the link before returning the laptop to Student Z.

The only interaction between the students on this assignment was letting Student AB borrow Student Z’s laptop. Student Z expressed his respect for the Honor Council.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence did not support that a violation had occurred. The students’ testimony indicated that no violation occurred, and was not contradicted by any submitted material evidence.

Vote #1: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred?

Yes: 0  
No: 9  
Abstentions: 0

Vote #2: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student Z is “In Violation?”

Yes: 0  
No: 9  
Abstentions: 0

Vote #3: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student AB is “In Violation?”

Yes: 0  
No: 9  
Abstentions: 0

**Decision:**

The Honor Council thus finds Student AB “Not In Violation” of the Honor Code.

The Honor Council thus finds Student Z “Not In Violation” of the Honor Code.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 30 minutes

Respectfully submitted,  
Bradley Hamilton  
Clerk