

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 16-1, Spring 2019
4/28/19

Members Present:

Matt Nobles (presiding), Stefano Romano (clerk), Reece Rosenthal, Izzie Karohl, James Suffoletta, Hugh O'Reilly

Ombuds: Zac Zalles

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Students A and B of using unauthorized aid 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
- Random student sample codes
- Syllabus clarification
- Background information
- Expert testimony
- Student A and B's full code
- Reference code
- Assignment description
- Relevant lecture slides

Plea:

Student A pled "not in violation."

Student B pled "not in violation."

Testimony:

Student A stated that she did not collaborate with Student B on the assignment. Most of their similarities arose out of reference code. Expert testimony shows that their code could have come about coincidentally. She then said that her commit times were not similar to Student B's. She did not go to office hours at all, and she did not consult Student B at all. She had only consulted the lecture slides and the reference code.

Student B pointed out that the expert testimony shows that she did not collaborate with Student A. All similarities were the result of using the same reference code and assignment description to complete the project. She showed that three of the sample students' codes were very similar to her own and Student A's. Student B then stated that she hadn't committed her code often throughout the semester, so the lack of commit history on this assignment should not lead Council members to believe that collaboration occurred. She did attend a TA's office hours, but she did not recall which TA, in what

way the TA helped her, and if Student A went to the TA as well. She used the assignment description, reference code, and lecture slides in completing this assignment. She did not cite the TA because she either did not use the TA's suggestion, or the help received was trivial.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence did not support that a violation occurred because the similarities between the two students' code were not very high.

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: 1 hour

Respectfully submitted,
Stefano Romano
Clerk