

**Abstract of the Honor Council****Case 4, Fall 2013****October 29<sup>th</sup>, 2013****Members Present:**

Adriana Bracho (presiding), Isabelle Lelogeais (clerk), Seth Lauer, Katie Stewart, Erin Rieger, Shantan Cheemerla, Sam Kwiatkowski, John Cavallo, Shep Patterson, Komal Agarwal, Josiah Grace

**Ombuds:** Amy Ryu**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of use of an unauthorized resource in a lower level Chemistry course.

**Evidence Submitted:**

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Course Syllabus
- Student A's Homework 5 and 6
- Fall 2012 HW 5 Key
- Fall 2012 HW 6 Key
- Fall 2013 HW 5 Key
- Fall 2013 HW 6 Key

**Plea:**

Student A pled "In Violation."

**Testimony:**

Student A began explaining how he came across the answer key for these homework assignments, saying that he found them in the classroom and picked them up. He continued to mention that he copied all of the answers almost entirely, and none of the work was his own. He explained that he had a lot of work and became overwhelmed, leading to his making a poor decision. In response to the questions of Honor Council members, he said that he knew what he was doing constituted a violation of the Honor Code. In closing, he stated that he is prepared to take full responsibility for his actions.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the evidence suggested blatant and complete plagiarism. His own testimony and admission also suggest that a violation has occurred.

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

Yes: 9+2 observing

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A committed the violation.

Straw Poll #2: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student A is “In Violation?”

Yes: 9+2 observing

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

**Penalty Deliberations:**

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. Most Council members considered the weight of the assignment in question as a relevant mitigating factor. Council members did not observe any relevant aggravating factors. Council members began discussing appropriate penalties. Members cited the fact that Student A plagiarized two separate assignments and did so flagrantly, knowing that he was committing a violation.

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

3 letter grade reduction: 0

2 letter grade reduction: 6

1 letter grade reduction: 3+2 observing

Letter of Reprimand 0

Abstentions: 0

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

3 letter grade reduction: 0

2 letter grade reduction: 9+1 observing

1 letter grade reduction: 1 observing

Letter of Reprimand 0

Abstentions: 0

Members who voted for a 1 letter grade reduction discussed their reasons for their votes. Most cited the fact that the weight of the assignment was very minor.

**Decision:**

The Honor Council thus finds Student A “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that he receive a 2 letter grade reduction in the course. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to his record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 23 minutes

Respectfully submitted,

Isabelle Lelogeais

Clerk