

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 41, Spring 2016
April 21, 2016

Members Present:

Katie Jensen (presiding), Owais Syed (clerk), Jake Reinhart, Alex Metcalf, Sara Meadow, Ike Arjmand

Ombuds: Aaron Shaw

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of plagiarizing an essay for a lower level English course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Course syllabus
- Student paper
- Annotated student paper
- Blog post
- Course plagiarism reading
- Student rough draft

Plea:

Student A pled "in violation".

Testimony:

Student A turned in a rough draft before the final draft. Student A reported not putting much effort into the first draft, looking up the blog summary as the source. He copied and pasted from the blog summary into the first draft, and did not include a bibliography. Student A then reported rewriting the final draft, but copied from the first draft to the final paper. The professor did not previously mention the passage as a concern with the rough draft. Since the bibliography was not required in the first draft, the student did not remember to include this specific source.

Student stated that he did not intend to violate the honor code, and referred to this incident as "a careless mistake".

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the student pled in violation and the letter of accusation was also supported in violation.

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

Yes: 6

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

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

Yes: 6

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

Penalty Deliberations:

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. No mitigating circumstances were seen appropriate because of significant portion that was significant in violation. No aggravating circumstances were seen appropriate.

Council members discussed an appropriate penalty suggesting that the portion of this exam is worth 25% of the course, which resulted in an agreement that an F in the course would be most appropriate. Council members agreed not only that this paper should be invalidated but also that the violation should result in no credit for the class.

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: 6

3 letter grade reduction: 0

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

Decision:

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

Time of testimony and deliberations: 25 min

Respectfully submitted,

Owais Syed

Clerk