

Abstracts AC28 – AC33

Professor Khloe and Student Kim in Psychology AC28

Kim was a senior in Professor Khloe's 300-level Psychology course. The course was a research methods course that aimed to assist seniors in their thesis work. The final paper for the class constituted a large part of the overall course grade. After reviewing the submitted final paper, Professor Khloe felt that some parts had used a voice other than Kim's. Points did not connect and there were different writing styles in the paper. Becoming concerned that parts of the final paper were not Kim's, Professor Khloe plugged in key phrases into a search engine and had found entire passages from where Kim seemed to have directly copied and pasted. The copied passages were not properly bracketed, quoted, or cited. Professor Khloe was saddened by the work submitted after having developed a great relationship with Kim in the class. Kim was bright and active. During the confrontation, Professor Khloe expressed concern and Kim blamed it on feeling overwhelmed and getting "sloppy" with citation.

At the hearing Kim expressed that she was under the impression that all work completed and submitted in the course were working drafts. As these were just drafts, Kim did not think she needed to thoroughly edit, cite and develop her ideas as it was just a draft that would be worked on for a long period of time and then finalized and submitted at the conclusion of her academic career in the form of a full thesis. Kim also expressed that she had taken on a more difficult course load than usual in order to complete her major requirements. With the semester winding down and several lengthy papers to write, she admitted to not giving Professor Khloe's final paper the time and effort it deserved. However, she felt that because it was a draft and the course description in the syllabus stated that work completed would be viewed as part of a larger process to write a final thesis, Kim thought it acceptable to submit work in the form of undeveloped outlines and ideas. At the hearing Professor Khloe explained to the Honor Board that the class allowed for discussing ideas and brainstorming, but she had expected that work submitted for grading be the student's own work, and not copied verbatim. The Honor Board decided that Kim was in violation of the Honor Code for having plagiarized on her final paper.

The Honor Board resolved that Kim receive a final grade of 1.7 in the course, be required to meet with the Writing Center 3-4 that semester and report back to her thesis adviser after each meeting, share Professor Khloe comments on the paper in question with her thesis adviser, and provide the Dean of the College a 1-2 page definition of plagiarism to be submitted by email by a specified deadline.

-Kim decided to submit an Appeal of Honor Board's the decision to the President of the College on the grounds that the entire Honor Board was not in attendance at the hearing and because the Dean of the College was not at the hearing, but rather her designee because of scheduling conflicts. The President of the College upheld the Honor Board's decision because Kim's argument for the Appeal was based on a clause in the Honor Code that describes the full composition of the Honor Board, which did not distinguish who is to be in attendance at a hearing. In regards to the attendance of the Dean of the College, Kim was made well aware before the hearing that the Dean of the College could not be in attendance. As such, Kim was asked to voice any concern over this change. The Honor Board informed Kim that the Dean to take the place of the Dean of the College would be a current member of the Dean's Office of equal experience at Bryn Mawr. Kim was informed of her rights to denying such a change and Kim chose not to voice any concern until much after the fact in her Appeal to the President of the College.

Professor Mario and Student Peach in Mathematics AC29

Peach was a senior in Professor Mario's 300-level mathematics course. Throughout the course students read, presented and discussed topics on which they were to follow up on by writing lecture reports. The course would be concluded with a final project paper on a topic of the student's choosing. When reviewing the lecture reports and final project paper, Professor Mario was alarmed to find that student Peach had copied direct lines from Wikipedia on a lecture report. Flags were raised when he noticed the lecture report introduced ideas that were never mentioned in class, discussions or in presentations. When Professor Mario confronted Peach, she said that she did not understand the topics in class so she used outside material to get a better understanding. Professor Mario was concerned because he had expected better work from a senior or at least a better attempt of incorporating outside materials and attributing the sources from which the information came in any way. Copying verbatim was unacceptable. After holding this conversation, Peach was asked to report herself to the Head of the Honor Board. Peach did not do as instructed, so Professor Mario followed up after having not heard from the Honor Board 48 hours later.

Professor Mario shared with the Honor Board and with Peach that there is a significant difference in consulting outside resources and actually copying them into submitted work. At the hearing Peach explained that the course syllabus did not give her thorough instructions on how to cite in written assignments or how to consult the proper sources to learn about citing. Being a mathematics major and being more familiar with computational work, writing for math proved to be a challenge for Peach. Peach admitted to not knowing better and admitted to using the internet, but did not understand why using such materials was wrong. At the hearing Professor Mario was able to identify entire lines and chunks in Peach's submitted work for the Honor Board and from where they had originated. No resources were acknowledged and the syllabus clearly stated that all submitted work had to be original. Bits of the final project paper also had sections copied verbatim from Wikipedia and the entire format of the final project paper was based on the format and order of the subject headers/outline on Wikipedia. Again, there was no acknowledgement for ever having consulted Wikipedia for any material. The Honor Board found Peach in violation of the Honor Code for having plagiarized on both her lecture report and her final project paper.

The Honor Board resolved that Peach receive a 0.0 in the course, meet with her professor to review the nature of plagiarism and issues that might arise around it in order to complete assignments to be submitted for grading, and write a 2 page report on the ethics and values underlying the responsibility to not plagiarize to be submitted to the Dean of the College by a specified deadline.

Professor Henry and Student Catherine and Student Anne in Computer Science AC30

Anne was a junior in Professor Henry's 200-level computer science course for which Catherine was a TA. After reviewing submitted work, Professor Henry found code that looked strangely familiarly to code he had graded a few semesters ago when he taught the same course. The code was originally submitted by Elizabeth, who was also TAing for the course with Catherine. Professor Henry talked to Elizabeth about the similarities between the originally submitted work and the newly submitted work by Anne. Elizabeth revealed that she had shared the code with her fellow TA Catherine only, and that Catherine may have used it to help Anne in de-bugging her code as she was experiencing a lot of difficulty in getting a program to work. Catherine and Anne worked for hours trying to de-bug Anne's program during TA sessions, but to no avail. Catherine offered to send Anne Elizabeth's work to use a resource to try to see where she may have gone wrong.

Professor Henry explained that Elizabeth had taken the class before and submitted exceptional work, so when Anne submitted the same work a year later, despite Professor Henry altering the overall assignment, it was very peculiar when he came across a new student addressing requirements that was assigned 2 semesters ago and not addressing the new requirements. Professor Henry requested to meet with Anne and asked that she explain to him how her program was expected to work. Anne could not explain how she expected her program to work or how she was able to come up with the coding that she submitted. When asked if she had copied code from elsewhere, Anne replied that she had asked for help from Catherine. She elaborated by explaining she had not shared any files or looked at anyone else's work. As the conversation continued, Anne went back on her words and admitted to having had access to another's work. Professor Henry then felt it appropriate to talk to Catherine to understand how Anne had gotten a hold of Elizabeth's work. Catherine was upfront about the situation and explained that she was talking to Elizabeth about the assignment in question. Elizabeth offered her old assignment to Catherine as a tool for understanding how things should work out and to aid her in TA sessions. In trying to help Anne, Catherine had used Elizabeth's assignment as a resource but even after hours of trying to see where Anne may have gone wrong, Catherine had shared Elizabeth's file with Anne because it was getting late. After the semester had ended and final grades were out, Anne saw her final grade and was upset with it. She asked to talk to Professor Henry, to which he agreed and it was then that he had mentioned the problem with copying code. At the hearing, Anne was found to have copied large chunks of Elizabeth's work without Catherine or Elizabeth's knowledge. Professor Henry was kind enough to provide hard copies of the computer code comparing the two assignments sides by side and color coding the parts that matched. The new assignment was overwhelmingly identical to the old assignment. Catherine had no idea that Anne would use the shared code to and submit it as her own. Professor Henry commented that Anne was a very bright and did exceptionally well in the class and that he assumes that out of frustration, she probably saw copying code as an opportunity to get out a stressful situation. When the Honor Board began conversation with Anne alone, Anne revealed she was overwhelmed that semester and during the time the computer science project was due, she had 5 other finals to complete within a short period of time having already purchased her flight back home. Anne also expressed that the project was designed to be a group project but she hadn't found anyone to work with her and preferred to work alone anyways. Anne worked hard and spent hours at TA sessions, but her program was just not working and time was running out. The Honor Board found Anne in violation of the Honor Code for using code intended as a resource inappropriately and for submitting a peer's work as her own for grading to her professor. Catherine was found in violation of the Honor Code for sharing code with a student even after it was expressly forbidden by the instructor. However, the Honor Board did listen to Catherine and did

understand that there was no malintent nor was she aware that the code would be used for other purposes besides de-bugging.

The Honor Board resolved that Anne receive a 0.0 on the assignment in question and have her finals transcript grade reflect the Honor Board's decision. Catherine was allowed to continue to TA, as the Professor made a note that Catherine was a great help to the department and because the Honor Board there was no malintent on her part, but she was asked to seek better ways to help a student without sending entire files from which they may copy. Professor Henry was also asked that if in the future there was ever question over the integrity of submitted work, that he leave the assignment, project, exam or quiz in question ungraded and recorded as incomplete in final records until the issue is resolved.

Professor Chopra and Student Priyanka in Physics AC31

Priyanka was a sophomore in Professor Chopra's 200-level English course. Professor Chopra had expected a final paper assignment before the end of finals week. At the time, Professor Chopra had not been on campus and was actually traveling overseas. When she finally got access to a computer with cooperative Wi-Fi and had the chance to look over submitted work, she had some difficulty in opening Priyanka's file. Being pretty well versed in computer problem shooting, Professor Chopra was able to discover that the attached file was self-described as, "empty," and the overall size of the file was too small for the work she had been expecting. Professor Chopra had tried to manipulate the file in many different ways and was unable to get anything out of it. Professor Chopra immediately sent an email to Priyanka inquiring about the assignment and got no response for days. Professor Chopra followed up with a few more emails and still heard nothing. Professor Chopra then got in touch with Information Services to see if there was anything they could do with the file and to get an understanding of whether Priyanka had access to the school's technology to understand how or why she was not hearing from Priyanka on the matter. When Professor Chopra finally did hear from Priyanka, Priyanka explained that she did not have access to a computer or her email following the submission of the assignment because she had traveled home. However, Information Services data showed that Priyanka did in fact use her account during the time in question and did so frequently. Priyanka had 3 other assignments that finals week for which she had asked extensions and those had all been submitted without any issue. Information Services also took a look at the file in question and commented that it was suspicious but the information gathered on it was inconclusive.

As the semester had ended, Professor Chopra asked to meet with Priyanka upon her return to Bryn Mawr the following semester. Priyanka again did not respond for days. When Professor Chopra got a hold of Priyanka, the student explained that her computer had a virus and that she was sick and could only begin to reply to emails when she came back to campus. She had no access to internet and her email while she was home recovering and she had to reformat her computer and had lost all the work she had completed the semester before. Priyanka also expressed that she did complete the assignment in question, but could not explain why the professor had not been able to open it. Professor Chopra revealed that Information Services had information that said otherwise in regards to her access to her emails and asked that Priyanka report herself to the Honor Board to further investigate what had actually happened.

At the hearing Professor Chopra explained to the Honor Board that glitches do happen and things do go wrong, but after reflecting on her conversation with Priyanka, she did not feel Priyanka was being honest about completing the assignment or about responding to the Professor. In regards to the final paper, when Professor Chopra asked Priyanka to describe her main arguments and her thoughts in putting the paper together, Priyanka was unable to describe any details about the work she claimed to have completed. Professor Chopra, considering the many years she had spent in academia, felt that any student who honestly crafted a final paper should be able to recall some of the thoughts used in it. The Honor Board was able to request information from Information resources and was able to uncover that Priyanka did have access to her Moodle during the time in question and had received and sent emails during the time in question. Priyanka responded to the information by stating that she had access via her iPad but otherwise could not establish connection for long periods of time, could not complete significant work on it, nor did she have access to any of the files that were completed and save on her personal computer, but Information Services also made a note that Priyanka had sent an attachment to another person during the time in question. Priyanka later revealed that she chose not to respond to Professor Chopra's email because she was scared. She also did not understand how to properly attach documents of why her

Microsoft Word wasn't cooperating. The Honor Board then asked why the other final papers or any other school assignments throughout the year had gone through without a problem, and Priyanka could not speak to that. In speaking alone with Priyanka, she revealed she greatly disliked writing and would work her hardest to avoid it if she could. The Honor Board was concerned about whether Bryn Mawr was the right place for someone like Priyanka and felt that she was bound to come across writing during her time here again. Her attitude towards written work was very displeasing and this attitude would prove to set her up for failure at Bryn Mawr. The Honor Board found Priyanka in violation of the Honor Code for having lied to her professor about having completed a final assignment by sending a fabricated corrupt file and for failing to communicate honestly and in a timely manner with her professor.

The Honor Board resolved that Priyanka receive a 0.0 in the course, write a letter of apology to Professor Chopra, and ask that she consult academic supports on campus to deal with her attitude with writing and with her struggle with time management.

Professor Roman and Student Nicki in Classics AC32

Nicki was a sophomore in Professor Roman's 200-level Classics course. On reviewing Nicki's paper, Professor Roman came across a particularly polished phrase and decided to Google it. She had found that the phrase was copied word for word from an online text. In going through the rest of Nicki's paper, Googling each sentence, Professor Roman had found 15 instances of plagiarized passages. Some of the sources used were SparkNotes.

During confrontation, Nicki expressed that the use of words from outside sources was accidental, but when Professor Roman revisited older drafts, the plagiarized passages were set in place then too. Professor Roman then revisited an older assignment and had found that Nicki had 3 instances of plagiarism pulled from a site called Gradesaver. When Nicki got to look over her papers, she also came to realize the words on the papers were not her own. She took full responsibility of submitting unoriginal work and promptly contacted the Head of the Honor Board.

At the hearing, Nicki expressed having felt intimidated by the class. There were many upperclass students enrolled in the course and Nicki could not find the word or ideas to best analyze the work at the level she felt other students could. Professor Roman commented that he had definitely seen a great deal of effort from Nicki and that it was a shame that she had to turn to outside resources in order to submit work.

The Honor Board resolved that Nicki receive a 0.0 on both of the assignments in question and that her final grade for the course be adjusted accordingly. Nicki was also asked to consult Professor Roman for the remainder of the assignments for the class and to take advantage of the College's Writing Center- explaining that this is a resource not for crisis mode but to help students throughout all stages of writing.

Professor Bellbiv, Professor Devoe and Students Jazzy and Jeff in Computer Science AC33

Students Jazzy and Jeff were first-year students in Professor Bellbiv and Professor Devoe's 100-level Computer Science course. Jazzy and Jeff were very good friends and often studied together. Jazzy had a slightly more difficult time with the course material than Jeff.

In grading an open-book exam, Professor Bellbiv and Professor Devoe found that Jazzy and Jeff's exams were identical in ways that implied cheating. The professors explained to the Honor Board that nearly "all" answers were identical- computer coding that was incorrect were incorrect in the same ways across the exams (and according to the professors, there is no way 2 students can have the same exact coding), and it seemed the students had deliberately planned to cheat as they choose the only 2 seats in the classroom that were isolated from the rest of the class. During separate confrontations, Jazzy and Jeff only admitted to studying together, and nothing else.

Professors Bellbiv and Professor Devoe supplied the Honor Board with copies of the exams in question to compare and contrast. The Honor Board had a difficult time attributing the similarities to just studying together. There were questions regarding coding, drawing and written responses to prompts that were identical across the exams- down to punctuation at times. The class syllabus mentions that collaboration is accepted for readings, but there was not to be any exchange of code or submission of another person's work.

At the hearing, Jeff explained that Jazzy had medical conditions and that she was struggling with the class. Jeff decided to support Jazzy as a friend. Jeff stated that Jazzy needed her for both academic and mental support. Jazzy had chosen the seats in the back and Jeff sat beside her for mental support during the exam. Jazzy confirmed her medical condition and confirmed that the College and her professors knew about it too. While Professor Bellbiv and Professor Devoe understood of Jazzy's needs, they did not see copying another student's answers as acceptable. After a long conversation between Jazzy, Jeff, Professor Bellbiv, Professor Devoe and the Honor Board, and then each of the parties individually with the Honor Board going over every problem in the exam, the Honor Board decided they had heard enough to piece together what had happened.

Jeff helped Jazzy and gave her exact copies of her notes which Jazzy used in the open-book exam. The use of another student's materials was still against class policy (and this was clearly stated in the syllabus) and this still constituted as academic theft. After much deliberation, it still was unclear whether Jazzy actually looked over at Jeff's paper and copied everything or used Jeff's notes to complete her exam- in either case, the material submitted was based off Jeff's work and not Jazzy's- down to punctuation, drawing style and word choice. Jeff expressed that Jazzy had guilted Jeff into helping and giving her all the material to prep for the test. Out of friendship, Jeff did not want to abandon Jazzy. Jeff felt that Jazzy took advantage of that.

The Honor Board resolved that Jazzy receive a 0.0 in the course and that she be separated from the College for at least 2 semesters to get her health in check. Her re enrollment would be based on whether she had taken steps to truly reflect on her duties as a student at Bryn Mawr, her commitment to the Honor Code and whether she received medical clearance at the time of enrollment. Jazzy was expected to seek the help of her Dean and the Health Center to in order to help her finish up the year.

The Honor Board resolved that Jeff fail the exam in question and to have a grade for the course capped at 1.7. Jeff did not meet her responsibilities as a Bryn Mawr student by sharing her academic materials and creating as well as witnessing an opportunity for someone to cheat- and did nothing. She was required to write a letter to the Dean of the College explaining her understandings of the violation and suggest proper ways for students to learn from this type of experience and avoid compromising community

values/standards in favor of a friendship.