

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 30, Spring 2017
April 13, 2017

Members Present:

Katie Jensen (presiding), Sofia Yi (clerk), Stefano Romano, Ricky Robinson, Grace Coleman, Peter Rizzi, Mustafa El-Gamal (observing)

Ombuds: Laura Li

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of multiple submission for a term paper in an upper level ECON course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Copy of the course syllabus
- Time stamps of Student A's paper edits
- Student A's meeting request email with professor
- Student A's topic proposal email with professor
- Student A's email correspondence with other student
- Copy of Student A's course paper
- Copy of Student A's paper for the other course
- Student A's meeting email exchange with professor
- Student A's evidence request email
- Copy of meeting sign-up sheet
- Student testimony submitted by Student A
- Rough draft of Student A's course paper
- Student A's topic proposal
- Additional student testimony submitted by Student A

Plea:

Student A pled "Not in Violation."

Testimony

Student A stated that this violation was due to a mistake, and that she took responsibility for that mistake.

She stated that she had written a paper on this topic for another course. At the beginning of this course, she asked the professor if it would be okay for her to write the term paper for this course on the same topic as her previous paper. The professor verbally gave her permission to do so.

Student A stated that when she began the paper for this course, she copied and pasted her paper from the previous course into a new document and began editing the paper to better address the topic for this course. She realized that this was not the best way to write her

new paper, and decided to start over and write a completely new essay in a blank document.

On the day the paper was due, she was unable to attend class. Because of this, she asked her friend to print out and submit her paper for her. She did not realize that she sent the wrong document (the first paper she worked on) to her friend for him to print out.

In addition, Student A missed a meeting with the professor due to a mistake in scheduling and was not able to discuss her draft with the professor prior to submission; however, she stated that the professor was aware that she had already written a paper on the same subject as a previous paper. The student also said that she decided not to cite her previous paper in the current one, as it contained no direct quotes. Student A concluded that the paper she submitted was only a rough draft and fully intended to turn in a different finalized product, and that the paper that was given to the professor was an accident.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the student submitted a near verbatim paper to multiple courses.

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

Yes: 6+1 observing

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A committed the violation. The Council saw no reason to indicate otherwise.

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

Yes: 6+1 observing

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

Penalty Deliberations:

Council members opened by discussing mitigating and aggravating circumstances. The Council saw no mitigating nor aggravating factors.

Council members then discussed the appropriate penalty for Student A. Although the paper was a significant portion of the final grade, the assignment in violation was a rough draft and the overall weight percentage was not defined. Due to the ambiguity of the weight of the assignment, council members adopted a more holistic approach to the penalty deliberation. The assignment and teacher-student meeting together were worth 50% of the overall course grade. Though Student A missed her scheduled teacher-student meeting, the Council believed she was only being accused of an Honor Code violation for multiple submission of the paper portion of the assignment. At Student A’s own estimation, the rough draft would account for at least 25% of the overall course grade. Due to the considerable weight of this assignment in the overall course grade, Council

members unanimously agreed that Student A did not deserve to receive credit for this course, i.e. an F in the course, but they also agreed that the violation did not warrant suspension.

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+1 observing
3 letter grade reduction:	0
2 letter grade reduction:	0
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 she receive an F in the course.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 45 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Sofia Yi
Clerk