

**Case Investigation Report**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**Please be advised that the alleged violator(s) and reporters will have the opportunity to review this form in the Honor & Integrity office, as well as members of the Honor Council who serve as hearing panelists.**

Case Investigators: CASE # <u>182-2009-20010</u>	Date Started: <u>September 26, 2010</u> Date Completed: <u>October 1, 2010</u>
---	---

Faculty CI: Professor Mundane

Student CI: Chuck Sampson

**Reporter Information**

Name/Rank: C  
Campus Address: 978 Bluemont Hall  
Campus Phone Number: 532-XXXX  
KSU Email Address: [xxxxxxx@ksu.edu](mailto:xxxxxxx@ksu.edu)

**Alleged Violator Information**

Name(s) of Alleged Violator(s): D  
Classification (Fr/So/Jr/Sr/Grad): Sophomore  
Phone Number: 785-313-XXXX  
Email Address: [yyyyy@ksu.edu](mailto:yyyyy@ksu.edu)

**Witness Information**

Name(s) of Witness(s): NA  
Rank/Classification: NA  
Phone Number: NA  
Email Address: NA

**Violation Information**

The student is alleged to have engaged in plagiarism while preparing and submitting a paper for grading. The instructor located a paper on-line which appears to be the origin of the original paper. The students paper seems to be a verbatim reformatting of the original text.

## Interview Summary:

**Reporter:**

**Date:**

**Time:**

**Location:** 215 Fairchild Hall

### Summary:

Instructor C reports that, on the first day of class, August 23, 2010, she handed out a syllabus to all students then in attendance. The syllabus includes a statement referring students to the Honor System web page and notifying them that this class comes under the jurisdiction of the Honor System.

At the following class session, August 25, 2010, the Instructor passed out the students' first assignment; a 3- to 4-page paper on a topic of the student's choice; a list of suggested topics was provided. Instructor C reports that she took about 20 minutes to explain the assignment to the students. The assignment indicates that the paper is to include a bibliography based on the research of at least two references. She also stated her belief that, by its very nature, the assignment of a written paper/essay implies "original work" or "one's own work." The paper was due on September 8, 2010, and would be worth 25 points out of 500 total points for the entire course.

The Reporter recalls her first meeting with the Alleged Violator, (name), to have been on September 1, 2010. Her attendance sheet indicates that he first attended class on that date. He had added the class late. After class on that day, she spoke with the Alleged Violator briefly (about 15 minutes) to explain a packet of course information she handed to him. She reports that she pointed out to him the "Policy" section of the syllabus, which includes a reference to the Honor System.

On the day the first assignment was due, the Alleged Violator approached Instructor C to ask if he could turn the paper in late. She reports that she informed him that she generally does not accept late papers but would make an exception if, as per his request, he could turn it in within a half-hour. By the end of the same day (5:00 pm), Instructor C reports that she had found the Alleged Violator's paper slid under her office door.

The Instructor began to grade the papers that weekend. When she started to read the Alleged Violator's paper, it sounded so familiar that she suspected it was not his original writing and traced its origins back to a web page <enter web page site> The Case Investigators have noted that the Alleged Violator's paper does appear to be a verbatim reformatting of the text of that web page. The Instructor also reports that no other students' papers exhibited evidence of similar plagiarism, that; in short; the other students had understood the nature of the assignment as one that was to represent one's own original work.

On September 14, 2010, the Instructor talked to the Honor System Director about the alleged violation and decided to file a report. The Instructor returned the graded papers on the next day, September 15, 2010, asking the Alleged Violator to meet with her after class. At that meeting, she informed him of his plagiarism and told him that she had submitted the matter to the Honor Council and to expect to be contacted by Honor System officials. She further reports that the Alleged Violator then claimed that he had been permitted to submit papers of this sort in other classes.

Instructor C also reports that she had had some misgivings about allowing the Alleged Violator to add the class late given the fact that he would be behind in the class in contrast to the other students who had been there from the first day. However, she allowed him to enroll late because the class had so few other male students and was looking to achieve more of a balance in the class membership. Therefore, she also had advised him to meet with other class members or to come to her office should he need help catching up. The Instructor reports that the Alleged Violator never came to her office for help and did, in fact, show up late to all class sessions. After she discussed the matter of alleged plagiarism with him, he never showed up to class again. The Instructor also expressed a desire not so much to be punitive but to help the Alleged Violator out of a difficult situation by allowing him to submit another paper. However, without an opportunity to talk to him and until the matter is adjudicated by the Honor Council, she has not been able to pursue this alternative.

## Interview Summary:

**Alleged Violator:**

**Date:**

**Time:**

**Location:** 215 Fairchild Hall

### Summary:

The Case Investigators met with the Alleged Violator, (name), on September 26, 2010, at 9:00 am., at 4:00 pm. The student is a freshman in (College), majoring in (Major). This is (student's name) first semester at K-State.

The Alleged Violator explained that he enrolled in (class) three classes late because he was wait-listed when he tried to initially enroll. He was interested in the class and wanted to take the it. His first attendance to class was September 1, 2010. The student recalled he met with (name), the instructor of (name of class), after class on that date. She handed him two pieces of information together, the syllabus for the course and the information packet for the first assignment.

The student chose to write his paper on (topic) because (reason). His interpretation of the assignment was to "write a life history on" the person in the discipline. The student said he went to the library to look for information on his topic. He then got on the Internet and found a website on (the topic). He copied the information on the website and pasted it in a word processing program. He turned in this as his assignment.

The student left the assignment at home on September 8, 2010. He explained this to the Instructor before class that day, and requested to be allowed to turn the paper in 15 minutes after class. Instructor C explained she didn't accept late papers. After class, the student approached Instructor C again, and she told him to bring the paper back within 15 minutes for credit. The student said he went directly home and brought back the paper to her office. The Instructor was not in her office at this time, so he slipped his paper under her office door.

On September 15, 2010 Instructor C handed the papers back to the students in (class). The student asked about his paper and Instructor C explained there was a problem with his paper and would like to speak with him. At the meeting, the Instructor explained there was a problem with his paper and she had turned the matter over to the Honor System. The student said he did not understand what that meant. The student asked if he could resubmit a new paper for the assignment, but the Instructor explained to him that it was too late for that because she had already turned the matter over to the Honor System. The student told us he was really confused and upset after the discussion with the Instructor.

After his meeting with Instructor (name), the student spoke with his advisor, (name), (title), to withdraw the class. He was not allowed to drop the class because this issue is unresolved. He has not attended class since the alleged violation occurred.

The student explained he does not understand the Honor System. He does not think he has seen any information on the Honor System during his two months at K-State prior to this occasion. He did not read the back of Instructor's syllabus where the Honor System is noted. He also told us the Instructor did not point this out to him until their meeting on September 15, 2010.

The Case Investigators further inquired into the student's method of writing this paper. The student explained he had never completed an assignment like this one. His understanding of the assignment was "to research the person and turn it in." The Case Investigators asked the student to define "Plagiarism". He explained that he knew cheating was to look at someone else's paper, while taking a test, to get the answer. The student said he never read the assignment sheet.

The student explained that he was behind in the class, but felt the degree of encouragement from the Instructor was less towards him than the other students. He explained to the Case Investigators that he felt she should have talked to him about this incident before turning it over to the Honor System.

**Interview Summary:**

**Witness:** NA

**Date:**

**Time:**

**Location:** 215 Fairchild Hall

**Summary:** NA

**Overall Summary and Conclusions based upon available information:**

There are distinct similarities between the website and the students paper. The student clearly does not understand plagiarism nor does he understand the honor system. While we believe the student may have completed this paper in good faith it is evident that sufficient information does exist to enter into the adjudication phase.

**Based upon the information we have gathered during the course of the investigation we:**

**X** have determined that sufficient information exists to move into the adjudication phase.

have determined that sufficient information does not exist to move into the adjudication phase.

**Your signature indicates that the above information is, to the best of your knowledge, a fair, accurate, and unbiased report of the interviews conducted during the investigation.**

**Faculty Case Investigator** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_

**Student Case Investigator** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_

**The Director has read the information contained in this report and concurs with your assessment.**

**Director, Honor & Integrity System**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Date** \_\_\_\_\_

**Director's Signature**