

Abstract of the Honor Council Case 23-2, Spring 2020

Members Present:

Virgina Xie (presiding), Ricky Robinson (clerk), Rishab Ramapriyan, Natalie Zur, Saniya Gayake, and Emily Wang

Ombuds: Pierson Lund

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of copying the code of a student from a previous semester for a 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
- Project Description
- Course Syllabus
- Random Student Sample Codes
- Lecture Materials
- Additional Code Comparisons for Accused Student and Supposed Source
- Student's Code Submission Files
- Screenshots of Code Comparison with Professor's Notes, an Online Search, and Project Submission Dates

Plea:

Student A pled "not in violation."

Testimony:

The student said that he did not copy any code from anyone and only used the code provided by the professor and notes from class and RLA sessions which are all allowed under the course Honor Code. The student then reiterated that he worked independently on this project. The student then explained how they followed the logic of the framework provided by the professor and proceeded to explain his logic within the code itself. He also included references to the sample code that applied the same logic and given variables. The student compared his own code to the code he supposedly copied from noting that they have different comments, ways of writing the functions, and variables. The student concluded by explaining the additional evidence he submitted.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation has not occurred because the council felt that the similarities are more likely due to chance than the copying of code considering they were largely attributable to the framework and code provided by the professor.

The Council began the discussion by talking about how there are similarities, but the similarities were attributable to the sample code provided by the professor. The project was also quite short so it would magnify any similarities but also explains why there is a possibility for similarities. The Council did discuss that the codes in question have structural similarities, but ultimately decided that it was not sufficient to constitute a violation.

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 “Not In Violation” of the Honor Code.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 55 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Ricky Robinson
Clerk