

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 11, Fall 2015
December 05, 2015

Members Present:

Alex Metcalf (presiding), Kristin Sweeney (clerk), Billy Rothwell, Allie Salter, Claire Bonnyman, Elliot Baerman, Owais Syed, Maghana Pannala, Anika Zaman

Ombuds: Katie Jensen

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of translating material found a website for an essay assignment in course SPAN 322. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- SPAN 322 Syllabus
- Student's Submitted Essay in Spanish compared to source in question
- Student's Submitted Essay in Spanish
- Professor clarification
- Student's Essay translated to English
- Translated Reviews from source of movie

Plea:

Student A pled "In Violation."

Testimony:

Student A was supposed to write a review for the course. Professor referenced source for examples, but he did not explicitly say that he could not use the sources. Student A realizes that sources are very similar but did not intend to plagiarize those sources. Student A closed by pleading in violation.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because Student A used a source incorrectly on an assignment without properly citing it. Furthermore, the syllabus explicitly forbade using sources in this manner. The essay was worth approximately 3% of the course grade, so a 2/3 LGR seemed to be most appropriate to assign a punitive aspect for the student's action.

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 and decided that he did.

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 discussed mitigating for weight of the assignment because it was worth roughly 3% of the course grade.

Council discussed 2/3 LGR as the most appropriate penalty. During the course of the discussion, 1/3 LGR and 1 LGR were brought up, but the Council decided the 1 LDR was too punitive while the 1/3 LGR was too light, based on the percentage of the course grade that the assignment was worth.

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

2 letter grade reduction: 0

1 letter grade reduction: 0

2/3 letter grade reduction: 9

1/3 letter grade reduction: 0

Letter of Reprimand: 0

Abstentions: 0

Decision:

The Honor Council thus finds Student A “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that he receive a 2/3LGR in the course.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 15 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Kristin Sweeney
Clerk