

**Abstract of the Honor Council  
Case 43-1, Spring 2023  
10/16/2023**

**Members Present:**

Rodolfo Gutierrez-Garcia (presiding), Olivia Thom (clerk), Kaylah Patel, Kamal Tijani, Bora Gobekli, Caroline Snider, Riya Yarlagadda (observing), Kofo Thomas (observing), Temilade Oluwasesin (observing)

**Ombuds:** Phillip Seo

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of unauthorized collaboration for a project in 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
- Previous Honor Council case abstracts involving similar details
- Comparisons between two students' codes accused
- Lecture material
- Random samples of code
- Canvas assignment submission of Student A
- MOSS Detection software explanation
- Other accused student's (not in hearing) secondary written statement
- Same student-as-above's (not in hearing) written statement
- Course syllabus
- Project instructions
- Project Bonus instructions
- PDF Student A sent to the other student
- Separate past student's code, brought up in comparison

**Plea:**

Student A pled "not in violation."

**Testimony:**

Student A stated that they did work on the project with the other accused student and other individuals as was allowed in the syllabus. However, close to the deadline, after they submitted the assignment, the other accused student was having issues and asked Student A for help. Student A did send their code to the other student for reference, but the other student admitted to copying Student A's code without Student A's knowledge. There was evidence of a third past student's code being similar to the other accused student's code, but Student A claimed they did not know this person. Student A

highlighted previous cases where the Council found students not in violation if they had been copied off of unknowingly.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the word-for-word similarities between the two students' code showed a violation against the collaboration policy for the project.

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

Yes: 6 + (3)  
 No: 0  
 Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A committed the violation. The Council discussed that Student A was not aware that their project was being copied when they sent it for reference, which would not constitute a violation of Student A's part. Furthermore, the Council also looked into possible similarities between Student A's code and the past student's code which was mentioned in the detection software but did not find sufficient similarities to suggest the code was copied. The Council also discussed a possible violation from Student A sending their project with all inputs and comments, but ultimately decided that a familiarity with the output software and a trust in the other accused student not to copy answers did not culminate into a violation on Student A's part.

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

Yes: 0  
 No: 6 + (3)  
 Abstentions: 0

**Decision:**

The Honor Council thus finds Student A "Not in Violation" of the Honor Code.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 48 minutes

Respectfully submitted,  
 Olivia Thom  
 Clerk