

**Abstract of the Honor Council**  
**Case 45-19, Fall 2014**  
**9 December 2015**

**Members Present:**

Alex Metcalf (presiding), Owais Syed (clerk), Reece Rosenthal, Nikki Thadani, Claire Bonnyman, Bradley Hamilton, Matt Roorda, Emilia Duno, Suzanne Wen

**Ombuds:** Katie Jensen

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student AB and Student W of sharing a clone link for a lower level COMP course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

**Evidence Submitted:**

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

**Plea:**

Student AB pled "not in violation."

**Testimony:**

Student AB remembered working in the same area as Student W at multiple different times. One time, Student W's computer ran out of battery, and Student W needed to borrow the computer of Student AB to finish the assignment. Student W sent clone links to the computer of Student AB so that he could work on his assignment and turn it in before the due date. Student AB never saw this code, Student W never showed his code to Student AB. Another time Student AB borrowed Student W's computer. Student AB also had to send a clone link to Student W's computer so he could work on Student W's computer with his own code. No code was transmitted between the students. Student AB closed by describing no code was shared, but only lending computers occurred.

**Plea:**

Student W pled "not in violation"

**Testimony:**

Student W described taking the lower level COMP course in the Fall of 2015. Student W discussed making multiple clone links to save different versions of his code. Student W was working in the same area as Student AB, and mentioned failures of stratocode with delays, slow operations, and timeouts. Student W described how he set up his local

environment since stratocode became very difficult to test. When Student W was having troubles with his local environment, Student AB ran tests on Student W's computer (using his own – Student AB – code) to troubleshoot the issues. Student AB used Student W's laptop to test the local environment. When Student W's laptop ran out of battery, he asked to borrow Student AB's laptop to simply write code. Student W specified that no code was shared between the two students. Student W closed with a statement about respecting the honor code.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members decided that there was not a preponderance of the evidence to support that a violation occurred, because the Council found that sharing the laptops explained the evidence without sharing code.

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 AB is “In Violation?”

Yes: 0  
 No: 9  
 Abstentions: 0

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

Yes: 0  
 No: 9  
 Abstentions: 0

**Decision:**

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

Time of testimony and deliberations: 26 min

Respectfully submitted,  
 Owais Syed  
 Clerk