

Abstract of the Honor Council**Case 1, Fall 2017****Oct 23, 2017 4:00 PM****Members Present:**

Reece Rosenthal (presiding), Ike Arjmand (clerk), Virginia Xie, Isabelle Bunten, Sam Holloway, Eva Lin

Ombuds: Laura Li

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Students A and B of unauthorized collaboration on a lab for lower level CAAM course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Student B's written statement
- A description of the assignment
- Each student's lab
- Class lecture slides and files
- A clarification from the professor
- The course syllabus

Plea:

Student A pled "Not in Violation."

Student B pled "Not in Violation."

Testimony:

Student A stated that the final projects are visibly very different, that the code itself is different, and that the comments in the code are different. He added that he and the other student had not discussed the project with each other. He also stated that because he and the other student approached the problem with different methods, they could not have cheated.

Student B stated that it is not unreasonable for two people to work in the commons on MatLab without collaborating, and that the differences in their code reflect that they did not collaborate.

The witness, a grader for the course, stated that the students' codes were markedly different, and that those differences reflected different approaches to the problems. The witness also stated that the students lost points for different errors, such as scaling or rotational errors on their graphs.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation had not occurred because the students approached the problem from different directions and made different mistakes, according to both the professor and the grader. The Council believed that the weight of the material evidence against a violation occurring outweighed the testimony of the accusation.

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

Yes: 0

No: 6

Abstentions: 0

Decision:

The Honor Council thus finds Students A and B “Not In Violation” of the Honor Code.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 23 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Ike Arjmand
Clerk