

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case #45-8, Spring 2015
9/15/15

Members Present:

Alex Metcalf (presiding), Emilia Duno (clerk), Billy Rothwell, Kristin Sweeney, Claire Bonnyman, Megana, Josiah Grace, Bradley Hamilton, Elliot Baerman

Ombuds: Sophie Schultz

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student N and Student H of plagiarism for a lower level computer science course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of accusation
- Student H's written statement
- Student N's written statement
- Assignment 7
- Class syllabus
- Professor clarification of class honor code policy and assignment
- Professor explanation of evidence
- Student H code
- Student N code
- TA statement

Plea:

Student H pled "Not in Violation"

Student N pled "Not in Violation"

Testimony:

Student H stated that they collaborated in design stages of the assignment and drew diagrams to better understand how to complete it. Student H stressed that functionality is very sensitive to order in this assignment. A council member asked where the students collaborated when working on the assignment. Student H responded that most of the collaboration took place in the TA sessions. A council member then asked if the diagrams that were collaborated on were then translated into code by themselves to which Student H responded that they did on their own.

Student N stated that there were some very basic functionalities to build this code and they were outlined in PowerPoints and detailed instructions given by the professor in class. She states that this would explain similarities in their code. She stated that they

tried to break down big problems into little problems and then find algorithmic solutions to make the code work. Student N asserted that the project was straightforward and to achieve functionality they would look very similar. They worked closely with a TA to do well on the assignment.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because

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 N is “In Violation?”

Yes: 0

No: 9

Abstentions: 0

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

Yes: 0

No: 9

Abstentions: 0

Decision:

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

Time of testimony and deliberations: 40 minutes

Respectfully submitted,

Emilia Duno

Clerk