Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 34-2a, Spring 2020
May 11, 2020

Members Present:
Ricky Robinson (presiding), Rohit Chouhan (clerk), Syed Shams, Rishab Ramapriyan, Riya Mehta, and Adam Zawierucha

Ombuds: Pierson Lund

Letter of Accusation:
The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of copying code from Student B 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
- Sample codes
- Lecture materials
- Professor clarification
- Student A submission picture
- Phone record evidence
- Email evidence with time stamp
- Student B written statement
- Ombuds checklist
- Student A submitted code
- Student B submitted code
- Class syllabus
- Main and bonus assignment description
- Code comparison file

Plea:
Student A pled "Not in violation"

Testimony:
Student A says she completed the unpledged assignment all by herself. She was contacted by Student B to get help. Student A tried to help over the phone, but it was difficult to explain over the phone. Student B asked for Student A's code to refer to. Student A sent Student B her code via email, understanding that the assignment was unpledged. Student A trusted Student B would

abide by the Honor Code and not copy her work. Student A refers to the phone record evidence and email evidence to support that she submitted the assignment before helping Student B.

Student A refers to the class syllabus to state that unpledged assignments encourage collaboration. According to Student A, the only possible violation is to publicly post the code online or if the student copy and pastes another student's work, which she says she did not. She also refers to the professor clarification in this portion.

Student A then explains the structure of her code to clarify why she needed to send the entire code instead of a single section.

Student A did contact Student B about the project before the phone call.

Verdict Deliberations:
Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the code is very similar between Student A and Student B. The code is very similar. Along with the email of the code being sent, the Council believes that the similarities most likely arose from copy and paste.

Straw Poll #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's story that the student completed the assignment on her own. The evidence supports that Student A helped Student B after she had completed the assignment. Therefore, the Council believes Student A completed the assignment on her own. In addition, the email is not considered to be posting code publicly online, so the Council believes that it does not violate this aspect of the class's honor code. Therefore, the Council does not believe Student A is in violation.

Straw Poll #2: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student A is "In Violation?"
Yes: 0
No: 6
Abstentions: 0

Time of testimony and deliberations: 26 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Rohit Chouhan
Clerk