

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 16-2, Spring 2019
4/4/19

Members Present:

Matt Nobles (presiding), Siddharth Gorantla (clerk), Grace Coleman, Angela Liu, Izzie Karohl, Joy Wang

Ombuds: Michael Katona, Laura Li (observing)

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B collaborating 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
- Random student sample code
- TA testimony
- Student A's code
- Student B's code
- Lecture slides

Plea:

Student A pled "Not in violation"

Student B pled "Not in violation"

Testimony:

Student A expressed that she did not know Student B before the hearing. There was a very defined way of doing the project, and her code was very similar to the random student sample. She did receive help from TAs.

Student B said she did not know Student A prior to the Honor Council procedures. She exhibited the vast amount of code she wrote for this project. She addressed the two functions she was accused of plagiarizing, and any accusations of plagiarism based on commit time were refuted. She also showed how her code was similar to the random student samples.

Verdict Deliberations:

The Council agreed that a lot of the code in question was very similar to the random student sample code. Expert testimony was considered in the favor of students.

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: 90 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Siddharth Gorantla
Clerk