

**Abstract of the Honor Council**  
**Case 45, Spring 2010**  
**June 27, 2010**

**Members Present:**

Lindsay Kirton (presiding), Jeff Worne (clerk), Kaleb Underwood, Austin Edwards, Trey Burns, Meghan Hall, Chris Koops

**Ombuds:** Becca Arriaga

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of plagiarizing a final paper in a lower level humanities course.

**Evidence Submitted:**

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Course Syllabus
- Assignment Prompt
- Student A's Final Paper
- Source of Alleged Plagiarism

**Plea:**

Student A pled "In Violation."

**Testimony:**

Student A began by telling the Council that he had a stressful family situation that the student felt caused him to plagiarize his essay. The student told the Council that he found the plagiarized source on the Internet and used it as his primary source. The student testified that he thought he had cited the plagiarized source, but had failed to do so.

The student attended most of the classes and was made aware of the plagiarism policy of the course, as well as appropriate citation practices.

The student's first draft was deemed unacceptable by the professor and the student then rewrote the essay as it appears in the evidence packet. His stressful family situation then occurred, which he testified led him to submit the plagiarized essay.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members felt that there was clear and convincing evidence that a violation occurred. The council made this determination based on the student's testimony, the submitted evidence, and the letter of accusation.

Straw Poll #1: Is there clear and convincing evidence that a violation occurred?

Yes: 7

No: 0  
Abstentions: 0

Council members believed that based on the evidence, Student A had committed the violation.

Straw Poll #2: Is there clear and convincing evidence that Student A is "In Violation?"

Yes: 7  
No: 0  
Abstentions: 0

Straw polls 1 and 2 were made binding.

**Penalty Deliberations:**

Council members discussed that the only appropriate mitigating circumstance was cooperation of the student through full and truthful disclosure. The Council also felt that the only appropriate aggravating circumstance was based on the nature of the violation as the final paper was a large percentage of the overall course grade. Thus, many Council members discussed that their mitigation would be canceled out by their aggravation.

Straw Poll #3: What is the appropriate penalty for Student A?

F in the course and 3 semesters of suspension: 0  
F in the course and 2 semesters of suspension: 6  
F in the course and 1 semester of suspension: 1  
F in the course: 0  
3 letter grade reduction: 0  
Abstentions: 0

A Council member felt that despite the fact that the student showed cooperation, the Council was not obligated to take off a full semester of suspension and based on the other unique facts of the case, the student's violation warranted the Council's starting penalty.

Straw Poll #4: What is the appropriate penalty for Student A?

F in the course and 3 semesters of suspension: 0  
F in the course and 2 semesters of suspension: 7  
F in the course and 1 semester of suspension: 0  
F in the course: 0  
Abstentions: 0

Straw poll 4 was made binding.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 28 minutes.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jeff Worne  
Clerk