

**Abstract of the Honor Council**  
**Case 13-5, Fall 2020**  
**February 2, 2021**

**Members Present:**

Sam Holloway (presiding), Sree Yeluri (clerk), Christopher Bi, Rodolfo Gutierrez-Garcia, Sriya Kakarla, and Adam Zawierucha

**Ombuds:** Neil Chopra, Jack Fain (observing)

**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 and accusing Student A and Student C of unauthorized collaboration on the same project (Student C took the Alternative Resolution). 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
- Project description
- Relevant lecture notes
- Random class sample code
- RLA Statements (x2)
- Student C's written testimony
- Student C's written statement

**Plea:**

Student A pled "not in violation."  
Student B pled "not in violation."

**Testimony:**

Student A stated that there was no copying of any code while working on this assignment. He said that while he did collaborate with Student B, this collaboration was allowed and even encouraged by the syllabus. Additionally, Student A demonstrated that the similarities between his code and Student B's code were reflected in other student samples. Student A explained that there were a few lines of code that Student A and Student B discussed verbally and hence had similar (but not identical) syntax. The remaining similarities, according to Student A, were reflected in the project description, class notes, and/or other student samples.

Student A additionally explained that any similarities between his and Student C's code could be explained by the fact that he discussed his code with Student C and Student C copied down exactly what was said by Student A, unbeknownst to Student A. Student A

submitted his project before Student C and asked the council members to refer to Student C's written testimony, in which Student C explains that Student A did not share his code with him and that Student A was not aware that Student C was copying down exactly what Student A verbally discussed.

Student B echoed Student A and stated that all collaboration was higher level and there was no copying of code between the two accused students. Student B used class lectures and allowed material to complete the assignment.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because another student copied Student A's code without his knowledge.

Vote #1: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred?

Yes: 6

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A and Student B committed the violation. Council members agreed that after comparing the code, hearing the testimonies by the accused, and reading the written statement by Student C, a violation had occurred, but Student A and Student B were not in violation. Their collaboration fell within the bounds of what was allowed by the syllabus.

Vote #2: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student A is "In Violation?"

Yes: 0

No: 6

Abstentions: 0

Vote #3: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student B is "In Violation?"

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: 60 minutes

Respectfully submitted,

Sree Yeluri

Clerk