

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 17-1, Fall 2017
March 21, 2018

Members Present:

Reece Rosenthal (presiding), Grant Wilkinson (clerk), Sofia Yi, Riya Mehta, Bella Bunten, Haihao Liu, Saniya Gayake (observing)

Ombuds: Kenton Whitmire

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of excessive collaboration on a project 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
- Full code link
- Supplementary Evidence
- Project Description
- Course Syllabus
- Student Submitted Evidence
- Random Code Samples
- Reference Codes

Plea:

Student A pled "Not in Violation."

Student B pled "Not in Violation."

Testimony:

Student A:

The students collaborated together on the project, explaining the similarities in timing of commits. The students collaborated together by breaking down the problem within the realm of the Honor Code of the course. The "lenspath" function was actually changed substantially. The reason the functions look similar is because the style guidelines had to be followed. The unusual course of both using the try/catch structure was using information learned in another course and as a result of Student A answering Student B's question about how to solve an error message. The second set of functions is substantially similar to other random sample. He went over the student submitted evidence of message screenshot and showing consistently few commits.

In his closing statement, Student A reiterated that the students worked together, explaining the similarities of the commit history and basic ideas of the problem

Student B:

Student A and Student B did collaborate but did so within the Honor Code. The students discussed the problem on a high level. The students both were aware of the try/catch structure through a different course in which both students were enrolled. The code being used as an example of excessive collaboration was the first commit, the final code was completely different from one another. Worked together on the project by collaborating at a high level but did not go beyond the collaboration allowed in the Honor Policy. He explained how there is only one way to create a j-array.

In his closing statement, Student B reiterated that the two students collaborated within the Honor Code Policy. The try-catch method was from another course. A lot of the evidence was from non-final commits as well.

Verdict Deliberations:

Certain Council members found compelling evidence that a violation occurred based off of the evidence that the students collaborated on a specific level on the problem presented in the project. Other Council members found that there was insubstantial evidence to show that the collaboration exceeded the guidelines outlined in the Honor Policy of the Syllabus. Without unanimity, the Council finds Student A and Student B not in violation.

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

Yes: 4

No: 2

Abstentions: 0

Decision:

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

Time of testimony and deliberations: 1 hour and 55 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Grant Wilkinson
Clerk