

**Abstract of the Honor Council**  
**Case 38-3, Spring 2020**  
**June 4, 2020**

**Members Present:**

Sam Holloway (presiding), Caroline Brehm (clerk), Adam Zawierucha, Emily Wang, Rapha Onyeka, and Kaitlyn Crowley

**Ombuds:** Michael Katona

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of copying code from a previous semester 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
- Course Syllabus
- Project Description
- Student A's project
- Code from previous semester
- Random student samples
- Class slides
- TA session slides

**Plea:**

Student A pled "not in violation."

**Testimony:**

Student A began her testimony by stating that she did not copy code and that she does not have a strong relationship with the student she is accused of copying from. Student A said she did collaborate with other students on the project, but since the project was unpledged, this collaboration did not violate the Honor Code. She asserted that all of the similar sections of code were either provided in class, the TA sessions, or were common approaches to the project. The student pointed out that the overall code structure was given to the students in the project description, which could account for the similarities between the codes. Student A also pointed out that several functions were provided during their TA session, and those functions are present in many of the student samples.

Student A then called in the student from the previous semester whom Student A was accused of copying code from. The witness was sworn in by the clerk. The witness said she did not send code to Student A and she did not post the code publicly online, so it would be impossible for Student A to copy her code. The witness concluded by saying that she did not share her code in full with anyone, but she did work with people in her residential college and her RLA session.

Student A ended her testimony by reiterating that the similarities between the codes arose because of the pseudocode and functions provided by the professor and TA's, and she asserted that she did not violate the Honor Code.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

The Honor Council believed a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation did not occur. While the Council agreed that the code was very similar, the evidence shows that the similarities could have arisen without direct copying and pasting. Since the course syllabus only defines unauthorized collaboration on unpledged project as copy/pasting, the Council ultimately decided the evidence does not support that Student A violated the Honor Code.

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

Yes: 1  
No: 5  
Abstentions: 0

**Decision:**

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

Time of testimony and deliberations: 1 hr. 25 min.

Respectfully submitted,  
Caroline Brehm  
Clerk