

**Abstract of the Honor Council****Case 4, Fall 2015****11/7/15****Members Present:**

Alex Metcalf (presiding), Jacob Schneckloth (clerk), Nick Conard, Destiney Randolph, Sara Meadow, Kristin Sweeney, Allie Salter, Komal Agarwal, Allen Hu

**Ombuds:** Katie Jensen**Letter of Accusation:**

The Honor Council received a letter accusing Student A and Student B of plagiarizing the data analysis section of a lab report for a lower level chemistry 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
- Course Syllabus
- Student A's report
- Student B's report
- Comparison of Student A's and Student B's data analysis sections

**Plea:**

Student A pled "In Violation." Student B pled "In Violation."

**Testimony:**

Student A testified that she and Student B crossed the line of collaboration allowed by the course for the discussion question section of the data analysis portion of the lab report. She claimed that they split up the five discussion questions and each answered a subset of them, sharing answers once they were finished. The council had no questions for Student A.

Student B also testified that she and Student A split up the five discussion questions in the data analysis section, sharing answers once they were completed. The council had no questions for Student B.

**Verdict Deliberations:**

Council members believed that a preponderance of the evidence supported that a violation occurred because of the testimony given by the students and the similarity of the answers in the students' reports.

Vote: 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. Due to student testimony, the council saw no reason to believe that Student A did not commit the violation.

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

Yes: 9

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

The Council then discussed whether or not Student B committed the violation. Again, due to student testimony, the council saw no reason to believe that Student B did not commit the violation.

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

Yes: 9

No: 0

Abstentions: 0

### **Penalty Deliberations:**

Council members opened by discussing mitigating circumstances. The council discussed possibly mitigating for the amount of the assignment in question and for the weight of the assignment. After a discussion of the course grading policy, it decided that it would not be mitigating.

Vote: Should Student A and Student B receive the same penalties?

9 Yes

0 No

0 Abstentions

The council members proposed a small range of penalties, but were able to come to a consensus following discussion.

Vote: What is the appropriate penalty for Student A and 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: 0

2 letter grade reduction: 0

1 letter grade reduction: 9

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 and Student B “In Violation” of the Honor Code and recommends that they receive a one letter grade reduction. A Prior Violation Flag is also attached to their records.

Time of testimony and deliberations: 45 minutes

Respectfully submitted,  
Jacob Schneckloth  
Clerk