

**Abstract of the Honor Council**  
**Case 18, Fall 2016**  
**January 17, 2017**

**Members Present:**

Katie Jensen (presiding), Stefano Romano (clerk), Hector Chaires, Dessy Akinfenwa, Alex Metcalf, Peter Rizzi

**Ombuds:** Sam Morimoto

**Letter of Accusation:**

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

**Evidence Submitted:**

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Student A's final paper
- Course syllabus
- Final paper instructions
- Selected writing samples
- Selected online articles

**Plea:**

Student A pled "not in violation."

**Testimony:**

Student A stated that she used the selected online articles to research her paper. However, the Student said that the ideas and interpretations found in the paper were above and beyond the online article, and that no plagiarism occurred. Additionally, even if the selected online articles did not exist, Student A stated that their paper would still have the same content and syntax. Student A also followed up by saying that the selected writing samples of the Student are not representative of the Student's full writing capabilities.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence does not support that a violation occurred because the similarities between the final paper and the selected online articles are not strong enough to indicate so.

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

Yes: 3

No: 3

Abstentions: 0

**Decision:**

The Honor Council thus finds Student A "Not In Violation" of the Honor Code.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 40 minutes

Respectfully submitted,  
Stefano Romano  
Clerk