

Abstract of the Honor Council

Case 24-4, Spring 2020

April 24, 2020

Members Present:

Ricky Robinson (presiding), Hannah Dryer (clerk), Natalie Zur, Sanat Mehta, Syed Shams, Sree Yeluri

Ombuds: Pierson Lund

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of unauthorized collaboration on 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
- Student B's written statement
- Student A's code
- Student B's code
- Code comparison
- Syllabus
- Random student samples
- Project description
- Student A's modification times
- Student B's modification times
- Course lecture slides
- Notes from RLA
- Project notes

Plea:

Student A pled "Not in violation".

Student B pled "Not in violation".

Testimony:

Student A explained that she worked with Student B on the project, as is allowed by the Honor Code, but that they did not copy each other's code nor look at each other's code. She explained that they used very well-known commands and that they received variable names and functions

from the same RLA. She also explained that similar input numbers were given in the project, which would explain the similarities in their code inputs.

Student B also pointed out multiple similarities in their codes and the random samples. Furthermore, both students claimed they discussed the project verbally, which is why their projects had similar structures. Student B also pointed out areas in her notes and the project description that led to the code that she submitted and affirmed that the similar structures originated from these sources, not unauthorized collaboration.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence did not support that a violation occurred because there were many differences between Student A and Student B's code. The similarities that did exist were explained by verbal collaboration, the project description, and RLA sessions. There was not enough evidence to show that a violation occurred as these similarities could have come from authorized collaboration.

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.

The Honor Council thus finds Student B "Not In Violation" of the Honor Code.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 45 minutes

Respectfully submitted,

Hannah Dryer

Clerk