

**Abstract of the Honor Council**  
**Case 17-6, Fall 2020**  
**March 9, 2021**

**Members Present:**

Sam Holloway (presiding), Sree Yeluri (clerk), Samantha Cheng, Rohit Chouhan, Zac Zalles, and Adam Zawierucha

**Ombuds:** Clayton Siminksi, Samantha Cheng (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. 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
- Student B's witness statement
- Relevant lecture notes
- Random class sample code
- Text conversation screenshots between Students A and B
- Submission time screenshot

**Plea:**

Student A pled "not in violation."

**Testimony:**

Student A stated that he completed the assignment in collaboration with a larger group of CAAM students as well as individually with Student B. Student A texted Student B the code to follow-up with what was discussed in person, with the intention of helping to clarify their rushed conversation. Student A did not have the intention of allowing Student B to copy this code. Based on Student B's testimony, Student B did copy Student A's code from the text messages.

According to the course syllabus, collaboration is allowed and Student A claimed that this discussion and sharing of the code is allowed. Additionally, Student A did not, at any point, use Student B's or any other students' code to complete his own project. Student A also did not publicly share code. Student A points out Honor Council Case SP\_2020\_34-2A, which outlines a similar situation, where the accused student shared their code via email and the student who received the code copied it. In this case, the verdict found the student sharing the code to be not in violation.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

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

Yes: 6

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

There is a clear admission and exchange of information between the accused students, reflected by a similarity in the codes, that demonstrates that a violation has occurred.

The Council then discussed whether Student A, in particular has committed a violation.

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

Yes: 1

No: 4

Abstentions: 1

The Council members deliberated on the evidence available, and the majority concluded that Student A technically did not violate the CAAM course syllabus. One reason is that Student A did not publicly post/share her code; instead, the text messages are similar to a collaborative, in-person exchange. Additionally, the wording of the syllabus strongly suggests that the person writing and submitting the code is completely liable for any violations (other than the line that prohibits one from publicly sharing/posting code). A final factor that some Council members considered is past precedent; a similar case concluded a student who shared their code with another student was *not* in violation and the student receiving and copying the code was in violation.

**Decision:**

The Honor Council thus finds Student A “Not In Violation” of the Honor Code.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 1 hr and 20 minutes

Respectfully submitted,  
Sree Yeluri  
Clerk