

**Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 4-6, Fall 2017
March 20, 2018**

Members Present:

Reece Rosenthal (presiding), Amy Lin (clerk), Matt Nobles, James Suffoletta, Haihao Liu, Siddharth Gorantla, Riya Mehta (observing)

Ombuds: Laura Li

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of collaborating on an assignment 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
- Student A's full code link
- Student B's full code link
- Course syllabus
- Sample code
- Class reference code
- Supplemental evidence

Plea:

Student A pled "not in violation."

Student B pled "not in violation."

Testimony:

Student A did not commit often because the code was not working. She followed the reference code provided, which may have caused similarities between the two students' work. In addition, the students looked at the same class slides together after a TA session and discussed concepts abstractly and not within the context of the project. The online coding program gave suggestions on what to code, which is why their code is similar and matches the sample code. She had issues with importing, which is why she added a specific package to her code. The students received very different grades, which means that their logic could not have been similar since the grading is based on certain tests that are passed.

Student B directly followed the reference code provided, which is allowed on the syllabus. The students collaborated conceptually on a higher level and looked at reference code together, but they did not copy code or look at each other's laptops. The package that she implemented was provided in the reference code; it was an option given to her by the professor. The students received different grades based on whichever tests they

passed, proving that the code did not perform the same. She committed very often (whenever she made a change) because of the close project deadline, which is why it was likely that one of their commit times matched.

Verdict Deliberations:

Some council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because one section of their assignment contained the exact same extraneous code.

Other council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence did not support that a violation occurred because the students' code matched the sample and reference codes.

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

Yes: 2

No: 4

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, 10 minutes

Respectfully submitted,

Amy Lin

Clerk