Abstract of the Honor Council  
Case 62, SPRING 2014  
9/4/2014

Members Present:  
Hurst Williamson (presiding), Shantan Cheemerla (clerk), Claire Bonnyman, Destiny Randolph, Jacob Schneckloth, Nick Shaver, Sarah Frazier, Kristin Sweeny, Owais Syed

Ombuds: Natalie Danckers

Letter of Accusation:  
The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of Plagiarism on a HOMEWORK assignment for an UPPER level PSYCHOLOGY course.

Evidence Submitted:  
- Letter of Accusation  
- Student A’s written statement  
- Course Syllabus  
- Student A’s Homework Assignment  
- Online Source

Plea:  
Student A pled “NOT IN VIOLATION.”

Testimony:  
Student A noted that the sentences suspected of being plagiarized were merely a summary of the online source, and so should not be considered plagiarism. The student believed that she had cited the paper appropriately, as she had included the author and the year. The student looked at the article while composing her paper. She stated that professors had previously told her that scientific papers could only be summarized in a few ways before losing the meaning of the paper. Student A concluded that although her sentences could be seen as similar to the online article, her paraphrasing was in line with how she had been taught to cite sources.

Verdict Deliberations:  
Council members noted that portions of Student A’s paper were word-for-word identical to the article. Council members noted that the student did include a reference to the paper.

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the student’s paper did not include quotations around direct quotes from the article.

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

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A committed the violation. The Council found no reason to suspect that Student A would not have committed the violation.

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

**Penalty Deliberations:**
Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. Council members mitigated for the weight of the assignment. Council members found no aggravating circumstances. Council members noted that the student attempted to cite the article, and it appears that the student was not aware of how to properly cite the source.

Vote #3: What is the appropriate penalty for Student A?
F in the course: 0
3 letter grade reduction: 0
2 letter grade reduction: 0
1 letter grade reduction: 0
Zero on the assignment: 9
Letter of Reprimand: 0
Abstentions: 0

**Decision:**
The Honor Council thus finds Student A “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that she receive a ZERO ON THE ASSIGNMENT. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to her record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 25 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Shantan Cheemerla
Clerk