

Abstracts UW11-UW19

Professor Peter and Student Pamela in Cities/Archaeology UW11

Pamela was taking a 300-level Cities/Archeology course. For her first paper, Professor Peter found that she had copied whole paragraphs of material directly from an internet website with citation, but without quotation marks. Pamela had met with Professor Peter previously to review her bibliography and speak about the topic, but had never expressed any difficulty with citation. Pamela was asked to turn herself into the Honor Board.

Upon review of the evidence, it was clear to *the Honor Board resolved* that Pamela has plagiarized portions of her paper. Given the circumstances of the case and the amount of evidence, Pamela was granted a 0.0 in the course. Additionally, Pamela was required to write a statement about plagiarism and proper citation using her own paper as an example. This statement had to be submitted to the Head of the Honor Board.

Professor Nelly and Student Nancy in Spanish UW12

Nancy was a senior taking a 300-level Spanish course. The course required a 20-page final paper, five pages of which had to be submitted as a graded draft. Nancy, during the stress of finals week and under stress from her personal life, left her draft until last. The day before it was due she began searching the internet for information. Nancy then copied from websites about a topic she wished to mold into her own when she had time to write the whole paper. Upon reading her draft, Professor Nelly noticed that portions of it were lifted directly from a website without any attribution. Disappointed that the student had not sought her help or considered other options for her draft (i.e. an extension), Professor Nelly asked Nancy to turn herself in.

When Nancy came before the Board, it was discovered that she had come before the Honor Board once before on a similar charge. Given the circumstances of her personal life, but also considering the fact that the student was a senior with ample knowledge of Bryn Mawr and the Honor Code, *the Honor Board resolved* that the student would fail the course. Additionally, the student had the choice to separate herself from the College from one semester (in order to get her personal life in order and consider the consequences of her actions), or remain at the College and take a load of no more than 3 courses. In either case, her graduation was delayed at least one semester.

Professor Plum and Student Apple in English UW13

Apple was taking a 300-level English course. The course required a 15-page final paper in lieu of an exam. The texts required for the course were complex, and thus no additional research was required for the final paper. Professor Plum asked each of the students to meet with her individually to discuss their paper topics. Apple struggled to keep up with the work for this course, and had difficulty grasping the materials. Upon being asked to write the final paper, Apple attempted to do some research, but ended up copying portions of her paper directly from a website. Her Professor discovered this and asked that she turn herself in to the Honor Board. The Honor Board agreed that substantial portions of the paper were plagiarized. *The Honor Board resolved* that Apple should receive a 0.0 in the course. Additionally, the Board recommended counseling for stress management. Apple was also required to meet with Gail Hemmeter in the Writing Center.

Student Quinn in PE UW14

Quinn was taking a PE course requiring written papers that were posted to the Serendip website. Quinn worked on one of the papers last minute, and did some careless research online related to her topic. She said that because she was not going to receive a grade for the course that the paper itself was not serious. The course was just a PE class, and should not be given as much attention as her academic course work. She admitted to copying and pasting directly from the websites to “her” paper without citation. Once again, because it was a PE paper, she did not think that citations were necessary. After turning the paper in, it was posted on the Serendip webpage. A while after it was posted, the athletics department was contacted by a reporter from New York who had been browsing the posted student papers. The reporter read Quinn’s paper and noticed that portions of it were lifted from another article on the internet, without citation. The paper was immediately removed from the Serendip webpage, and Quinn confronted and asked to report herself to the Honor Board.

Upon reviewing the evidence, *the Honor Board resolved* that Quinn’s PE credit be revoked. The student had already taken the initiative to seek help citing sources. The student was also required to talk with an Honor Board member regarding the Honor Code.

Professor Bo and Student Bessie in Economics UW15

Bessie was taking a 200-level Economics class. Her life was kind of a mess, and she was really stressed out about her classes: so on the first take home exam—closed book, closed notes—she searched the internet, and cut-and-pasted most of her answers for the exam.

On the next exam, she did it again. Professor Bo finished grading the first exam after he had distributed the second one, and so he called Bessie into his office to confront her about the first exam after she had cheated on the second one. Bessie eventually confessed to having cheated, and volunteered the information about her cheating on the second exam before her professor had a chance to grade it and notice.

The Honor Board resolved that Bessie was guilty of cheating and plagiarizing on her exams, and she was given a 0.0 on both of them with no chance to retake them. The Honor Board also strongly recommended that Bessie see a counselor.

Professor Jack and Students Jill and Jane in Economics UW16

Jill and Jane were in the same 300-level Economics course. Jill was going to be out of town the day the last exam of the semester was due in class, and so Jill asked for (and got) a one-day extension. Jill claims that she went by Professor Jack's office the day she was supposed to turn in her exam, but Professor Jack wasn't in. So Jill held on to her exam over the weekend, and turned it in when she saw Professor Jack the following week. Jane, on the other hand, turned her paper in on time, during class when it was originally due. When the professor was grading the exams, he noticed that Jill's and Jane's exams were very similar, including some rather unusual mistakes. Jill was the weaker student, and Professor Jack believed that Jill had cheated, although he was not sure whether Jill cheated with or without Jane's consent. When asked about their exams, Jill and Jane both claimed not to know the other very well at all, claimed not to have studied with anyone including each other, and both adamantly denied cheating.

In the end *the Honor Board resolved* that even with the irregularities surrounding turning the exams in, there was insufficient evidence of whether Jill or Jane were cheating or of misconduct during the exam period. The matter was left undecided.

Professor AliG and Students Ethel, Enid and Ester in a Final Examination Room UW17

Three students were taking their final exams in the same room in the PSB: Ethel, Enid, and Ester. Ethel and Enid noticed that Ester seemed to have an awful lot of papers on her desk: the professor allowed one sheet of equations for the exam. Ethel and Enid spoke with Ester about the exam when it was over, and Ester insisted that she had used quite a few blue books, and that she hadn't used any notes at all, not even the approved sheet (though it was out on her desk during the exam). Professor AliG said he had no reason to suspect Ester of cheating, and both Ethel and Enid could not agree on exactly what it was they saw, though they suspected it might have been cheating.

The matter was dropped due to insufficient evidence for the Honor Board to decide one way or another.

Professor Cedric and Student Myrtle in Spanish UW18

Myrtle had a bad junior year. Despite working constantly in her Spanish class, she couldn't seem to learn it, and Myrtle was worried about fulfilling her language requirement. Her family, to whom Myrtle was very close, was having some serious problems and her class workload was exceptionally demanding. For her final research paper in a 300 level psychology class, Myrtle turned in a paper that she found on the Internet. Later that week, she cut-and-pasted several answers for her final take-home exam from various websites as well. Myrtle confessed when confronted by Professor Cedric, and seemed to be in a very bad emotional state. Because of the severity of the infraction, *the Honor Board resolved* that Myrtle received a 0.0 in the course, and was separated from the college for at least one semester, with the Honor Board strongly recommending that she stay away for a full year. During her separation, Myrtle was required to keep in contact with her Dean. The Honor Board also recommended that she be tested for a learning disability with regards to language study.

Dean Johnson and Student Jessie UW19

Jessie was applying for a fellowship, and in her last minute effort to get the application in before the deadline, Jessie cut-and-pasted material from a website into her proposal. Jessie put the website's address at the bottom of her proposal as a source of additional information, and when one of the fellowship committee members went to the website, she noticed the wording from

Jessie's proposal. When her Dean asked Jessie about it, Jessie responded that since it wasn't for a class, she didn't realize she needed to officially cite the information. Jessie was not chosen for the fellowship because she was not a particularly strong applicant.

The Honor Board met after the fellowship application process was over. Jessie was found guilty of plagiarism. Because the incident did not involve classwork, and because Jessie claimed not to have misrepresented the words from the website as her own work intentionally, but rather by accident, *the Honor Board resolved* that Jessie to write a letter of apology to the members of the fellowship committee and to meet with Gail Hemmeter in the Writing Center to discuss what is and is not proper citing and usage.