

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 5-3, Fall 2017
February 13, 2018

Members Present:

Reece Rosenthal (presiding), Stefano Romano (clerk), Sam Holloway, Rohit Chouhan, Mark Cantu, James Suffoletta

Ombuds: Sam Morimoto

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Students A and B 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 A's written statement
- Student B's written statement
- Class slides
- Text conversations with TA
- Full code comparison link
- Student A's full code
- Student B's full code
- Project description
- Random class code samples
- Reference code
- Student-submitted commits
- Student A's calendar
- Professor example code
- Course syllabus
- Supplementary evidence from professor

Plea:

Student A pled "Not In Violation." Student B pled "Not In Violation."

Testimony:

Student A started by reviewing the scope of the project, and stating that because the scope of the project is so small, there are limited ways to complete the project. Student A then stated that the similarities in his code with the other student's arose from a TA session that both students attended. Student A then went through the similarities in his code and showed how these similarities are present in other students' sample code.

Student B started by stating that he only collaborated with the other student within the Honor Code guidelines for the class, and that the similarities between the two students' code arose from attending the same TA session for this project. Additionally, the similar

commit times for the two students results from completing the homework after the TA session. Student B then showed where the thought process for different parts of his code came from with regard to class slides.

Student A closed by stating that the similarities in the two students' code stem from attending the same TA session. He then stated that the project had little room for creative freedom, and that there are few possible ways to complete the project. He then concluded by stating that their test cases are structured in similar ways to that of other students in the random class sample codes.

Student B closed by reiterating that he followed the course Honor Code policy, and that all timing and code similarities result from both students attending the same TA session. Student B then stated that a lot of his code comes from similar code in the professor's course slides, and that his code style is similar to that of the professor's for this assignment.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence did not support that a violation occurred because the similarities in the two students' codes could be explained by collaboration at the TA session within the course's Honor Code policy.

Vote #3: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred?

Yes: 5

No: 1

Abstentions: 0

Decision:

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

Time of testimony and deliberations: 2 hours, 10 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Stefano Romano
Clerk