

Abstracts AC15- AC16, UW 39- UW41

Professor Sully and Student Boo in Psychology AC15

Boo was a junior in Professor Sully's 200-level Psychology course. Boo was approached by Professor Sully about a written journal-style/literary review assignment. When reading the assignment, Professor Sully felt a lot of the ideas were disconnected and felt like there were several different "voices" in a paper. The assignment asked for original plans for a project, and Boo did not deliver such. Boo posed summaries of articles she had not fully read as conclusions to her own work, copied in entire lines without proper attribution and claimed that she did not understand how to approach the assignment when the professor had spent many class hours going over specifically that, as well as outlining the assignment in detail in the class syllabus (which could also be found on Moodle) where the professor had also made note of acceptable citation styles. Boo admitted to plagiarizing and expressed she had a large course load that semester and was pushed into committing this academic dishonesty. She was stressed, was suffering from mental-blocks and could not find enough time to finish everything the way she would have liked.

The Honor Board resolved that Boo receive a 0.0 on the project in question, write a 2-page reflective piece on proper citation to hand in to Professor Sully and to meet with her Dean to discuss course selection that would best suit her.

Professor Smith and Students Alexandra and Rebecca in French UW39

Alexandra was a sophomore in Professor Smith's 100-level French course. Rebecca, a freshman, noticed Alexandra using her Blackberry smartphone during the Final exam. When confronted by Professor Smith during the examination, Alexandra stated she was using the phone to keep time, however Rebecca felt strongly that her actions were unacceptable and she confronted her together with Professor Smith at a later date. Rebecca was sure that messages were received and sent during the exam period. Professor Smith and Rebecca were not pleased with the explanations provided during the confrontation and decided to have Alexandra report herself to the Honor Board. Rebecca explained to the Honor Board that Alexandra's actions were distracting to her and other students taking the Final exam.

During the hearing, the Honor Board also learned that because Alexandra did not receive credit for the 100-level French course that she potentially took advantage of, she took an un-proctored language proficiency exam to gain credit for the Foreign Language Requirement. Because of Alexandra's

behavior during the proctored French exam, the Honor Board was suspicious that Alexandra may have used her smartphone during the unproctored proficiency exam to gain credit.

There was no evidence to prove that Alexandra used her smartphone to cheat, but the Honor Board agreed that Alexandra's use of her smartphone in an examination room had distracted other students during a Final exam and this action was in violation of the spirit of the Honor Code.

The Honor Board resolved that Alexandra meet weekly with the Head of the Honor Board to discuss the community's Honor Code, examination policies, as well as retake the Foreign Language Proficiency exam to ensure that she gained credit fairly.

Professor Stephens and Student Robert (HC) in Classics UW40

Robert was a junior at Haverford College taking a 200-level Classics course with Professor Stephens. Robert was required to write an essay on an ancient city. After handing in the essay late, Professor Stephens noticed several sections of the essay that were taken verbatim from a website he found online. These sections were not cited, and other sections of the essay were taken verbatim from text reviewed in the course.

Robert explained to the Honor Board that as a science major he has a hard time writing long essays and that his extra-curricular schedule did not allow him to have enough time to focus on the assignment.

The Honor Board resolved that Robert receive a 0.0 for the essay assignment, rewrite the assignment in consultation with Professor Stephens, and receive a capped grade of 2.0 for the course. Robert's Dean was notified of the resolutions that followed the case.

Professor Wilson and Student Jessica in Statistics UW41

Jessica was a sophomore in Professor Wilson's 100-level Statistics course. Jessica was struggling with the course, but needed credit to fulfill her Division II requirement. While grading one of Jessica's exams, Professor Wilson noted that Jessica's answers were uncharacteristic and similar to that of another student's.

During the hearing, Jessica explained to the Honor Board that she cheated by copying another student's answers because she feared a failing grade would not allow her to pass the course.

The Honor Board resolved that Jessica receive a 0.0 for the exam, attend office hours or Undergraduate TA sessions at least once a week, and write a reflective essay on the importance and privilege of having credit/no-credit classes.

Professor Freddy and Students Velma and Daphne in Economics AC16

Velma and Daphne were first year students in Professor Freddy's 100-level Economics course. Professor Freddy had noticed that the wording in 2 exams were "too similar." When Professor Freddy returned the exam blue-books to his students, he wrote in Daphne and Velma's books to come see him after class. Velma asked to speak with Professor Freddy alone first. She admitted to having taken Daphne's completed exam as a mistake as it was atop the pile. She then admitted to opening it up and looking at it just to double-check her work. She then copied answers out of panic. Velma attributed her panic to having not studied enough because of taking on too many extracurriculars. Velma also shared she was under a lot of stress and may have resorted to cheating to keep her GPA high enough to hold on to funding that allowed her to pursue an education at Bryn Mawr. At the hearing Velma expressed she had actively tried to do better in the course. Professor disagreed, stating that Velma's attendance could have been much better and that he had never seen her at office hours. It was also revealed that Velma had committed academic dishonesty during her senior year in high school- which was of great concern to the Honor Board.

The Honor Board felt Daphne was lying both to the Honor Board and to her professor about understanding what it means to complete an exam honestly. Copying over 60% of Daphne's exam didn't support wanting to simply "double-check." *The Honor Board resolved* that Velma write a letter to the student whose exam she stole, receive a 0.0 in the course and be suspended from the College the following semester.

-The student had a second appearance in front of the Honor Board as a senior for academic dishonesty while abroad in Transylvania. (AC40). After reviewing the materials for that case, the Honor Board felt Velma could no longer continue her studies at Bryn Mawr. To be a student at Bryn Mawr, one must abide by a Code of Honor, which the Honor Board felt Velma could not do. The student did not act honorably as a Bryn Mawr student and it appeared she did not take advantage of her second chance to regain a good standing in the community. Velma did not appear to value the responsibility that came with the privilege of the Honor Code.