

**Abstract of the Honor Council****Case 27, Spring 2014****2/25/14****Members Present:**

Isabela Lelogeais (presiding), Hurst Williamson (clerk), Seth Lauer, Adriana Bracho, Shep Patterson, Clinton Willbanks, Avani Shah, Allen Hu, Kamal Agarwal

**Ombuds:** Jayme Smith

**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A of plagiarism in a lower level computer science course.

**Evidence Submitted:**

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Course Syllabus
- Assignment Questions
- Assignment Instructions
- Professor Deposition
- Tutor Deposition
- Accused Submission
- Tornado Sightings Submission
- Sample Solutions
- Sample Exams

**Plea:**

Student A pled "In Violation."

**Testimony:**

In his opening statement Student A said that he was working with his tutor, who provided him access to a completed version of the question from a previous semester. Student A then turned in this previously completed version as his own work.

Student A stated that his tutor was a fellow athlete in the same grade who often worked with him on multiple assignments. Student A said that at the time he asked his tutor for assistance he was planning to use his tutor's file as a guideline, but then ended up turning in his tutor's file as his own work. Student A stated that he believed that his tutor did not know that he had copied his file. Student A then added that this was the only file that he turned in that was not his own work.

In his closing statement Student A said that he did submit his tutor's file and that he did understand that he was in violation of the Honor Code.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because of Student A’s testimony as well as the unnecessary captions included in the submitted file.

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

Yes: 9  
 No: 0  
 Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student A committed the violation. No one saw anything to the contrary.

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

Yes: 9  
 No: 0  
 Abstentions: 0

**Penalty Deliberations:**

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. The Council only believed that the small weight of the assignment warranted mitigation. No one saw any aggravating factors. The majority of the Council believed that a two letter grade reduction was the most appropriate penalty for Student A due to the egregious nature of this violation.

Straw Poll #4: What is the appropriate penalty for Student A?

F in the course: 0  
 3 letter grade reduction: 0  
 2 letter grade reduction: 9  
 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: 00:32:00

Respectfully submitted,  
 Hurst Williamson

Clerk