

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 1-6, Fall 2018
1/22/19

Members Present:

Matt Nobles (presiding), Matey Yanakiev (clerk), Sean Olsen, Angela Liu, Eunice Aissi, Siddharth Gorantla

Ombuds: Laura Li

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of collaborating on a pledged project for a 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
- Random student samples
- Professor clarification
- RLA notes
- Class example code
- Project description
- Relevant course lecture slides
- Course syllabus

Plea:

Student A pled "not in violation."

Student B pled "not in violation."

Testimony:

Student A stated that he used the code provided by the professor, and he had never worked with Student B. He used generic variable names that were a logical choice based on the information presented in both the lectures and the RLA sessions, and he used no unauthorized materials for the project. He also said that it was not explicitly against the Honor Code policy of the course to copy the outline or the comments provided in the project description. He reemphasized that all of his work was his own original work.

Student B pointed out that his comments came directly from the project description. He said that he had never met Student A, and the only part of the project that was similar was the first comment. He clarified that this is the header that describes what the project is, which should be similar among all students. He concluded by saying that all of his work was his own original work.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation did not occur because the code itself was completely different. The only overlap was the comments, which matched the project description.

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 Student A and Student B “Not In Violation” of the Honor Code.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 35 minutes

Respectfully submitted,

Matey Yanakiev

Clerk