

**Abstract of the Honor Council**  
**Case 14, Spring 2019**  
**4/22/19**

**Members Present:**

Virginia Xie (presiding), Amy Lin (clerk), Sanat Mehta, Hugh O'Reilly, James Suffoletta, Maheen Khizar

**Ombuds:** Michael Katona

**Letter of Accusation:**

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

**Evidence Submitted:**

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Student B's written statement
- Random student samples
- Course syllabus
- Student A assignment
- Student B assignment
- Class grading rubric
- Assignment description
- Plagiarism source

**Plea:**

Student A pled "not in violation."

Student B pled "not in violation."

**Testimony:**

Student A explained that the purpose of the assignment was to summarize a paper. She started by using a paraphrasing tool to generate new ideas and rewrite certain sections of the paper. After using the word replacement program, she reread through the generated summary and rewrote parts of it in her own words.

Student B said that the assignment was based off of a document provided by the professor. The students were required to answer a set of questions related to the document, and the professor clarified that the purpose of the assignment was to paraphrase the document. She used an online program to paraphrase the document and then rewrote sections of the paraphrased segment. She didn't realize that this wasn't allowed since she had previously used the tool on other assignments.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because the submitted work was not their original work. The submitted papers were too similar to the original source and had no citations.

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 and Student B committed the violation. The Council members found no reason to not find them in violation.

Vote #2: Does a preponderance of the evidence support that Student A and Student B are "In Violation?"

Yes: 6  
 No: 0  
 Abstentions: 0

**Penalty Deliberations:**

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. Council members found no reason to mitigate or aggravate for Student B, but Council members decided to aggravate for Student A due to a prior violation.

The CPS penalty for this case, based on the weight of the assignment, is a 3 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: 5  
 F in the course: 1  
 3 letter grade reduction: 0  
 2 letter grade reduction: 0  
 1 letter grade reduction: 0  
 Letter of Reprimand: 0  
 Abstentions: 0

Vote #4: What is the appropriate penalty for Student B?

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: 6  
 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 and 1 semester of suspension.

The Honor Council thus finds Student B “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that she receive a 3 letter grade reduction.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 35 minutes

Respectfully submitted,  
Amy Lin  
Clerk