

**Abstract of the Honor Council****Case #6, Fall 2015****11/22/2015****Members Present:**

Alex Metcalf (presiding), Mario Aragon (clerk), Elliot Baerman, Nicole Thadani, Bradley Hamilton, Suzanne Wen, Emilia Duno, Meghana Pannala, Kristin Sweeney.

**Ombuds:** Katie Jensen**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of plagiarism on a written assignment for a lower level BIOC course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

**Evidence Submitted:**

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Student Paper
- Student Source
- Grade Breakdown
- BIOS 201 Syllabus
- Literature-based papers instructions

**Plea:**

Student A pled "In Violation."

**Testimony:**

The student stated that some parts of her paper were copied from the abstract of the source paper. She acknowledges that she is 'In Violation' of the Honor Code.

The student wanted to use the abstract of the source paper as an intro for her own paper, knowing that it was a violation of the Honor Code. The student said she took notes from the source paper and used those notes to write her own paper, but did not copy and paste material directly into her own paper. Instead, she stated that it was more of a transcription of information from the source paper abstract into her notes and into her own paper.

In her closing statement, the student reiterated that she copied the abstract of the source paper into her own paper. She acknowledges that she is in the wrong for copying without proper citation.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the student's testimony and evidence both indicated that a violation occurred.

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. Student testimony and evidence both indicated a violation occurred.

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 Council mitigated for the weight of the assignment, but some Council members aggravated for deceit of the Council, since the student stated that only the abstract was copied, but this was clearly not the case. There were additional sections of the student paper that were copied from the source paper

Discussion of penalties swung between a 2/3 LGR and a 1 LGR. However, as discussion progressed, the Council agreed on a 1 LGR due to the aggravating factors present.

Vote #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: 0  
 F in the course and 1 semester of suspension: 0  
 F in the course: 0  
 3 letter grade reduction: 0  
 2 letter grade reduction: 0  
 1 letter grade reduction: 9  
 2/3 letter grade reduction: 0  
 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 she receive 1 letter grade reduction.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 40 minutes

Respectfully submitted,  
Mario Aragon  
Clerk