

## **Abstract UW05-UW10**

### **Professor Larry and Student Lucy in Chemistry UW05**

Lucy e-mailed her chemistry professor on the day of the test. She said she had urgent business out-of-town and wouldn't be able to take the test during the scheduled time. When she contacted Professor Larry the next week, he had already given the makeup test and posted the answer key. He suggested she just take the 0.0 on the test. Lucy insisted that she didn't look at the answer key and asked to take the test. Her professor agreed and sent her to the chemistry lounge with the test. When he went to check on Lucy's progress, he found her consulting a copy of the answer key. Lucy reported herself to the Honor Board.

When the Honor Board convened, they discovered this was not the first time Lucy was brought in front of the Board. In the previous case there was insignificant evidence to make a decision and she was uncooperative in the stipulations the Board imposed.

Since it did not appear that Lucy could live and interact within the spirit of the Honor Code, and she was given multiple warnings and assistance, *the Honor Board resolved* to exclude Lucy from further study at Bryn Mawr College.

### **Professor Cartesian and Students Emiline, Betsy and Lola in Mathematics UW06**

Emiline and Betsy were good friends, both taking a 200-level math course together. Emiline had a good friend, Lola, who had taken the class the year before. Lola, being the helpful friend she is, lent Emiline her old review sheet for the course. Emiline, also a giving friend, photocopied this review sheet for Betsy to study for an upcoming exam. The exam was a take-home midterm.

Emiline said she took the exam in the evening in Collier library, without knowledge of where or when Betsy would be taking the exam. However, when Professor Cartesian read Betsy and Emiline's exams, he noticed striking similarities between the methods and steps used to answer each question. Suspecting possible dishonesty, the case was brought to the Honor Board.

Upon review of the evidence, *the Honor Board resolved* that the answers were suspiciously similar, but there was not enough compelling evidence to conclude that Emiline and Betsy were guilty of cheating.

### **Professor Frank and Student Francine in French UW07**

Francine was taking an introductory French course. As the semester drew to a close, the students were required to write a final paper, including reviewed rough drafts. When Francine turned in her rough draft, Professor Frank noticed that the French in the essay was antiquated and quite complicated for even a native speaker. Determined to find out what had happened, the Professor turned to Yahoo. After “Yahooing” portions of the prose from Francine’s draft, Professor Frank found that substantial portions of her essay were lifted directly from one website, without any quotation marks or citations. When Professor Frank confronted Francine, she admitted she used multiple internet websites in her research, but only for a few expressions. After quite a bit of discussion, the Professor came forth and told Francine that she knew large portions of her essay were lifted directly from one website. Francine was then asked to contact the Head of the Honor Board.

Francine insisted she was always completely honest with her Professor, and that the portions of the paper from the website were simple sections she was unsure of how to properly cite. She believed that not citing in a rough draft she was turning in for review was ok.

*The Honor Board resolved* that, even though she claims that she intended to add citations in the final paper, her explanation is not sufficient to explain the volume of material lifted directly from one website without any form of acknowledgment. The Honor Board decided that Francine would receive a 0.0 on the paper. Additionally, Francine had to meet with Gail Hemmeter in the Writing Center to review proper citation. Finally, a correctly rewritten essay was submitted to the Dean of the Undergraduate College for review.

### **Professor Bob and Students Marian and Gilda in Sociology UW08**

Marian and Gilda were both students in a 200-level Sociology course. Course requirements included regularly assigned problem sets. Professor Bob encouraged students in his course to work together on problem sets, but expected each student to do all computer work and write-ups independently. Marian and Gilda regularly worked together on their problem sets. For one particular problem set, Professor Bob was grading and noticed that Marian’s printed-out computer work was a photocopied version of Gilda’s. Furthermore, Marian’s write-up contained peculiar errors, very similar to those on Gilda’s write-up.

When confronted, Marian explained that she and Gilda regularly worked on problem sets together, as they had with this one. When the day rolled around for the problem set to be turned-in, Marian realized she had lost hers. Gilda gave Marian her full, finished assignment to photocopy just the data sheet, so at least Marian could redo her write-up. However, while redoing her write-up, Marian chose to use Gilda's write-up as a guide, and ended up using more of Gilda's original work than she had intended. Marian was going through a particularly stressful period of her life, and expressed that she had not intended to rely so heavily on Gilda's write-up. The Board agreed that Marian understood the severity of her mistake, and that it was not likely to be repeated. *The Honor Board resolved* that Marian receive a 0.0 on the problem set in question.

### **Professor Kelly and Students Kathy and Sarah in French UW09**

Katie was taking an introductory French course, and was asked to write a paper interpreting either a movie viewed in class or a book the class read together. Katie chose to analyze the book. Katie wrote a first draft and brought it to Professor Kelly, who found that Katie was having problems interpreting the text and formulating her own ideas without summarizing. After discussing the text with her Professor, Katie was sent off to give the essay another try. While writing her second draft, Katie felt she still did not quite understand the text. Katie then sought the help of Sarah, a very strong French student in her class. Katie asked Sarah if she could look at her final essay, just to help give her an idea of the storyline. Katie finished her paper and they both turned in their respective final drafts. Upon grading Katie's final draft, her Professor found that portions of Katie's analysis and even direct quotes from Sarah's essay were taken without attribution of any kind. Seeing this as plagiarism, Professor Kelly turned Katie into the Honor Board.

The Honor Board agreed that Katie did indeed copy portions of Sarah's essay. *The Honor Board resolved* that Katie must confess to Sarah that she used her work, and then write another paper on the movie (instead of the book). This new, second paper would receive no credit, but would require her to work closely with her Professor. Katie's effort on her second paper (the one on the movie) will not affect her final grade; however, the Board decided that 15% of Katie's final grade will be a 0.0.

### **Professor Sally and Student Suzanna in French UW10**

Suzanne was having a really stressful finals period. Her workload was overwhelming her, especially her work in her introductory French course. The night before her final paper for the class was due, Suzanne was struggling to find her own words, and turned to a website for help. At first, Suzanne attempted to put the French text from the website into her own words. After a while, however, she gave up and just copied directly. Upon reading her essay, Professor Sally discovered this, confronted her, and asked her to turn herself into the Honor Board.

Suzanne was completely honest about the context of her violation, and accepted full responsibility for her actions. The paper constituted 5% of her final grade. *The Honor Board resolved* that Suzanna fail her paper with a 0.0