

Abstract of the Honor Council
Case 48, Spring 2015
December 8th, 2015

Members Present:

Alex Metcalf (presiding), Claire Bonnyman (clerk), Nikki Thadani, Owais Syed, Jacob Schneckloth, Josiah Grace, Meghana Pannala, Emilia Duno, Destiney Randolph

Ombuds: Carey Wang, Kenton Whitmire (observing)

Letter of Accusation:

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

Evidence Submitted:

- Letter of Accusation
- Student A's written statement
- Course Syllabus
- Research paper guidelines
- Plagiarized source #1
- Plagiarized source #2
- Student A's submitted work

Plea:

Student A pled "in violation."

Testimony:

Student A opened by recapping the incident in which her computer crashed the night before the paper was due and she had to redo it. She was stressed and sleep-deprived, which drove her to plagiarize. She said that a large part of the assignment is in violation. The paper she submitted was the first of two drafts that were due in this class and she removed the plagiarized sections for the final draft. She closed by saying that she understands that she violated the Honor Code and thought it was the best choice at the time.

Verdict Deliberations:

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because of the student's testimony, the professor's accusation, and the evidence submitted.

Vote #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. Since there were no other people involved in the case, there was no reason that Student A would not be in violation.

Vote #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 did not find any reasons to mitigate. There were no aggravating factors. The Council was split between a 2 letter grade reduction and a 3 letter grade reduction because a majority of the assignment was in violation and the weight of the assignment in the course was not insignificant. The Council discussed further and decided that a 3 letter grade would be too punitive for the weight of the assignment so they agreed on a 2 letter grade reduction.

Vote #4: 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: 9

1 letter grade reduction: 0

2/3 letter grade reduction: 0

1/3 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 a 2 letter grade reduction.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 20 minutes

Respectfully submitted,

Claire Bonnyman

Clerk