

**Abstract of the Honor Council  
Case 64, Spring 2016  
October 5<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

**Members Present:**

Reece Rosenthal (presiding), Claire Bonnyman (clerk), Stefano Romano, Ike Arjmand, Angel Garcias, Ellen Diemert

**Ombuds:** Colin Losey

**Letter of Accusation:**

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

**Evidence Submitted:**

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Student Paper – annotated
- Websites 1-4
- Course Syllabus

**Plea:**

Student A pled “in violation.”

**Testimony:**

Student A referred Council members to the two versions of her paper. She stated that she accidentally submitted the rough draft of her essay because the names of the two drafts were similar. She told Council members that she usually writes her papers by collecting sources then crafting her final draft. She also told Council members that she did not change her final draft between submitting her rough draft and receiving her Honor Council accusation. She emphasized that she accidentally submitted the rough draft. She drew attention to the citations that were present in the final draft and then admitted that 3 of her 27 citations attributed information to incorrect sources. One Council member asked why she used different sources in her two bibliographies. She addressed this inconsistency by saying that some of the sources in her draft were not used in her final essay. In her closing statement, she accepted responsibility for submitting the rough draft with plagiarized material and reiterated that she did include citations in her final paper, even though few of them were incorrect.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because Student A submitted a largely plagiarized essay and even if the final draft had been submitted, it contained incorrect citations, which is also a violation. Additionally, Council members agreed that they did not feel comfortable considering the amount of time that passed between when Student A saw her accusation letter and when she submitted her final draft to the Ombuds.

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

Yes: 6  
 No: 0  
 Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A committed the violation. Council members saw no evidence to the contrary.

Vote: 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 and aggravating circumstances and agreed that there were none. Council members discussed penalties and many were in favor of an F in the course due to the conditions set by the Consensus Penalty Structure. However, Student A has been found in violation in the past, which made the Council members reconsider the penalty. A majority of the Council members decided that, because Student A has now been found in violation in two separate instances, an F in the course and 1 semester of suspension would be the most appropriate penalty.

Vote: 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: 4  
 F in the course: 2  
 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 she receive an F in the course and 1 semester of suspension. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to her record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 1 hour

Respectfully submitted,  
 Claire Bonnyman  
 Clerk