Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 45-17, Fall 2014
12/7/15

Members Present:
Alex Metcalf (presiding), Owais Syed (clerk), Reece Rosenthal, Destiny Randolph, Elliot Baerman, Sara Meadow, Jake Hassel, Meghana Pannala, Claire Bonnyman

Ombuds: Katie Jensen

Letter of Accusation:
The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student AB, Student W and Student Z of disallowed collaboration on a programming assignment for a lower level COMP course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:
▪ Letter of Accusation Redacted
▪ Student AB's written statement
▪ Student W's written statement
▪ Student Z's written statement
▪ Course Syllabus
▪ Professor Clarification

Plea:
Student AB pled "not in violation"

Testimony:
Student AB began by saying that the supposed violation occurred a while ago, and some parts of his memory are not clear. However, the student then stated that he was working in the same area as the other students who were accused. According to Student AB, he often needed to test code on another computer since his computer was having difficulties running the necessary programs. Student AB stated he did not receive any clone links of other's code. Student AB stated that his computer was not meeting the demands of the assignment because his Java environment was not working. Student AB described the necessity of the Java environment in supporting various functions by proper installation and testing of his code. He described how he found it difficult to work on his own computer. Thus, he sent stratocode links to the computer of another student to work on his own code from a computer that had the appropriate set-up.

Plea:
Student W pled "not in violation"

Testimony:
Student W described stratocode as an unreliable program, with delays of 5-10 seconds before results are given, and how the server might time out. Because of these issues,

Student W would often need to work on the computers of other students. To transfer his code from his own computer to a properly functioning computer, Student W would have to send clone links. Using those clone links, Student W would test his code on another laptop. To close, Student W re-emphasized that he had no reason to violate the honor code, and he did not do so.

Plea:
Student Z pled "not in violation"

Testimony:
Student Z described a night of working on the assignment in question. Student Z was asked by Student W to borrow his laptop, to use the local environment on the laptop. Student Z stated he never saw or received code from student W. Student Z emphasized no code transmission occurred between him and Student W. Student Z emphasized how borrowing a laptop was not an honor code violation.

Verdict Deliberations:
Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence did not support that a violation occurred. Student explanations of needing to borrow others' laptops would explain the transfer log in the submitted evidence, and there was no material evidence to indicate anything else occurred.

Vote #1: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that a violation occurred?
Yes: 0
No: 9
Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student AB, Student W, and Student Z committed the violation. Seeing as how the Council had just determined that a violation had not occurred, there was no reason to find these students in violation of the Honor Code.

Vote #2: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student AB is "In Violation?"
Yes: 0
No: 9
Abstentions: 0

Vote #3: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student W is "In Violation?"
Yes: 0
No: 9
Abstentions: 0

Vote #4: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student Z is "In Violation?"
Yes: 0
No: 9

Abstentions: 0

Decision:
The Honor Council thus finds Students AB, W, and Z "Not In Violation" of the Honor Code.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 14 min

Respectfully submitted,
Owais Syed
Clerk