

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 28, Fall 2015
April 7th, 2016

Members Present:

Alex Metcalf (presiding), Reece Rosenthal (clerk), Sara Meadow, Hector Chairez, Emily Wu, Dessy Akinfenwa, Haihao Liu, Ike Arjmand, Sophia Yi

Ombuds: Matt Nobles

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of plagiarizing on the final paper for an upper level PSYC course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Final Paper
- All 8 Articles in Question
- Professor Response
- Paper Requirements
- Syllabus
- The Draft with Comments
- Sample Introduction
- Example Student Papers

Plea:

Student A pled "Not in violation"

Testimony:

Student A explained that she wrote several drafts of the paper, meeting to discuss the paper with the professor. Student indicated that, had her paper had any issues with citations or writing, the professor could have brought up concerns. The student asked if summarizing was okay to the professor, and the professor said yes.

Student indicated that she asked and discussed the APA format, though there was never a discussion with the professor of what the term "summarize" meant. The student also indicated that only a small portion of the paper was in question.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a

violation occurred because, when the papers and the sources were compared, the phrasing was identical which is indicative of a plagiarized portion of the paper. Significant chunks of a graded paper were plagiarized.

2

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 saw no reason otherwise.

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.

The councilmembers did not see any mitigating factors.

Vote 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: 0

F in the course and 1 semester of suspension: 0

F in the course: 0

3 letter grade reduction: 9

2 letter grade reduction: 0

1 letter grade reduction: 0

2/3 letter grade reduction: 0

1/3 letter grade reduction: 0

Letter of Reprimand: 0

Abstentions: 0

The council indicated that the paper was worth a significant amount, meaning a punitive penalty was appropriate.

Decision:

The Honor Council thus finds Student A “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that she receive a three letter grade reduction. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to her record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 1 hour

Respectfully submitted,
Reece Rosenthal

3

Clerk