

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 18-7, Fall 2017
April 13, 2018

Members Present:

Reece Rosenthal (presiding), Ricky Robinson (clerk), Bella Bunten, Grace Coleman, Sam Holloway, and Virginia Xie

Ombuds: Pierson Lund

Letter of Accusation:

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of plagiarizing on a homework assignment for an upper level COMP course. The Chair read the Letter of Accusation aloud in full.

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Point Breakdown Clarification
- Student's Homework
- Suspected Homework Solutions Source
- Syllabus
- Homework Description

Plea:

Student A pled "not in violation."

Testimony:

The student stated that she had seen the suspected website prior to the assignment and thus was familiar with the information. She also stated that the examples she provided were the simplest possible counterexamples available and that she is able to explain them. The student that described that her examples were intuitive and not copied despite having similarities to the suspected source. The student added that she had written out the answers to the problem when she saw it before this assignment but did not have access to those notes during this assignment. The student said she found this site by using Google to find solutions to problems from textbooks while preparing for an interview. Then, the student said that she got the idea for the wording of the solution from previously seeing the suspected source and by coming to it intuitively. The student concluded that her responses came from familiarity with the source and their simplistic nature.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the answers that the student gave are nearly identical to the suspected source and that the familiarity with the problem would not justify this. The diagrams used are also very similar to the suspected source, which provides further evidence of a violation.

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 decided that Student A was in violation for the reasons stated above.

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. The council decided to mitigate for the amount of the assignment not in violation because it is only one part of one problem.

The CPS penalty for this case, based on the weight of the assignment, is a 2 letter grade reduction.

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: 0

1 letter grade reduction: 6

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 a 1 letter grade reduction.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 35 minutes

Respectfully submitted,
Ricky Robinson
Clerk