

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 5, Fall 2016
October 23, 2016

Members Present:

Katie Jensen (presiding), Stefano Romano (clerk), Angel Garces, Ellen Diemert, Richard Bui, Sofia Yi

Ombuds: Aaron Shaw

Letter of Accusation:

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

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Course syllabus
- Student A's paper
- Internet article
- One of Student A's previous papers

Plea:

Student A pled "In Violation."

Testimony:

Student A stated that he did not intend to violate the Honor Code with this assignment. Student A said that in high school, he has always cited only direct quotes, which is the procedure that the student followed in writing the paper in question. He did not mean to paraphrase the article from class without citation, as he thought citation was not necessary for paraphrased sentences and ideas. The student stated that the lack of citation in his paper was merely a misunderstanding, and was not purposeful in intent.

In his closing statement, Student A did not mean to represent the article's work as his own, he only meant to add onto the article's thoughts and ideas, and had absolutely no malicious intent in his paraphrasing.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because Student A's paper paraphrased another article without citation.

Vote #1: 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. The Council found no reason to believe that Student A did not commit a violation.

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. Council members did not find any mitigating or aggravating circumstances. Following the consensus penalty structure, council members agreed that a two letter grade reduction is appropriate given the assignment’s weight in 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: 0

3 letter grade reduction: 0

2 letter grade reduction: 6

1 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 a two letter grade reduction. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to his record.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 20 minutes

Respectfully submitted,

Stefano Romano

Clerk