

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 13-4, Fall 2020
March 6, 2021

Members Present:

Izzie Karohl (presiding), Rohit Chouhan (clerk), Rapha Onyeka, Kamal Tijani, Emily Wang, and Sriya Kakarla

Ombuds: Thelo Lewis

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of giving unauthorized aid 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
- Project description
- Course syllabus
- Student A's submission timestamp
- Student B's submission timestamp
- Random samples (x10)
- Student A's project submission
- Student B's project submission
- Material from lectures
- Case 34-2 Abstract

Plea:

Student A pled "Not in Violation"

Testimony:

Student A said he finished the project and submitted it on time, as shown in the timestamp evidence. Afterwards, Student A was contacted by Student B for help. After attempting to explain a specific concept over the phone, Student A had to go to a previous commitment so he sent a section of his code which referenced the portion he had attempted to describe. Student A claims that Student B copied Student A's code snippet and submitted the project late.

Student A also cited case SP_2020_34-2 and explained that the student who was unknowingly copied off of was also found "not in violation."

Student A claimed he did not change his code after talking to Student B. According to timestamp of submission, Student A submitted his before they communicated. However, Student A was unable to find the screenshot he had sent to Student B because it was sent over an application where the picture is not savable unless a screenshot is taken.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the submitted projects have very similar portions of the code, including line-by-line similarity in certain sections.

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 committed the violation.

The Council believes Student A was not in violation because he did not copy code. The class also encourages collaboration on unpledged assignments. The syllabus says that the student should submit code they understand, which Student A did entirely.

The Council, however, noted that Student A did send unauthorized aid. At the same time, Student A was under the impression that the code provided would not be copied by Student B. His phone call prior to sending a snapshot of the code he was referencing demonstrated that he fully attempted to comply with the course Honor Code and was unknowingly taken advantage of by Student B, as confirmed in Student B's written statement.

The Council also referenced the abstract of case SP_2020_34-2 in which the student who was unknowingly copied was found "not in violation" and ruled with the same precedent.

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

Yes: 0
 No: 6
 Abstentions: 0

Decision:

The Honor Council thus finds Students A "Not In Violation" of the Honor Code.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 53 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
 Rohit Chouhan
 Clerk