

Abstracts AC17-AC18

Professor Dip and Student Lo in English/Education AC17

Lo was a sophomore in Professor Dip's 200-level English course. Lo was anxious to get home but still had an assignment due on Blackboard by an evening deadline before she was officially "done."

Professor Dip had asked that a hard-copy be submitted, but Lo was already home. At home Lo was using her father's computer. Internet connection was bad and Blackboard was having some connectivity issues. After submitting the paper, Lo closed the laptop and started her summer with her family. Days later Lo checked her email and found that Professor Dip had written her inquiring as to whether the assignment was ever sent in and if not, why not. Lo apologized and could not explain why it had not sent. She reattached it and sent it to her professor by email. Professor Dip felt that Lo may have been making up stories in order to get an extension. Professor Dip then asked Lo to report herself to the Honor Board.

Upon contacting the Head of the Honor Board, there were many emails sent back and forth and some confusion as a result. Professor Dip was a visiting professor, so scheduling with him became very difficult and Lo was starting to get anxious and was hurt by the accusation that she was untruthful in her communications with Professor Dip.

At the hearing, Lo was charged with lying to her professor, breaking the test-taking honor policy by taking longer on an assignment than allowed and was asked to show the Honor Board how exactly she submitted the assignment in question. When Lo was given the computer to demonstrate, she could not find anywhere on Blackboard that had the assignment. She could not explain why it wasn't there but she distinctly remembered submitting it through a Blackboard portal on the professor's class page. Lo started to withdraw herself from the Honor Board conversation and found it hard to find the words to describe how she was feeling or what had happened.

The Honor Board resolved that Lo be granted a 0.0 for the course in question and that she be separated from the College for the following semester, with her return based on a re-admission process in which she had to show the College that she was ready to return to Bryn Mawr and resume her studies. All cases with a resolution regarding removal from the College is allowed to an Appeal. If Lo decided not to Appeal, the resolution stood.

-Student Lo filed for an Appeal (a review of the case by the President of the College). Lo stressed that she did not lie or cheat to any extent and that proper statement procedure was not followed by the Head

of the Honor Board. Lo's first email with the Head of the Honor Board was used as her statement in the hearing and Lo expressed that she had written a more formal statement for the Honor Board which was not used at the hearing. Lo also had her parents write to the President of the College vouching for the story that she had in fact been using her father's computer and that they did see her finish the assignment by the deadline in order to join the family in celebrating a sibling's graduation. Lo had the best of intentions and nothing in her past record would say otherwise. Although Appeals do not allow new evidence or materials to be submitted, the absence of Lo's formal statement for the hearing was grounds for a reviewing the case and allowing the Appeal. Threads of emails between Lo and the Head of the Honor Board were reviewed by the President of the College and attested to incorrect statement submission and review. The President overturned the decision of separation from the College, but let the 0.0 for the course stand.

Professor Boots, Professor Diego and Student Dora in Environmental Science AC18

Dora was a junior in Professor Boots and Professor Diego's 100-level Environmental Science course. Dora had to write a summary/reflection on a scientific paper for class. Upon reviewing the summary, Professor Boots and Professor Diego had found that Dora's paper was very similar to a published review that could be found online. When confronting Dora about the similarities, at first Dora did not understand that the ideas she had included in her paper were unoriginal and were too well developed. She did not make the immediate connection that she had essentially borrowed someone else's ideas from a published online review. With further conversation Dora did reveal that she did in fact use the published review to guide her in composing her paper summary. She hadn't realized she had relied so heavily on this published review and she apologized profusely. In looking at the submitted paper summary closely Dora definitely saw that she had used the published review's structure and thoughts beyond what was acceptable and that she should have cited it for having relied on it so heavily. At the hearing Professor Diego felt that the instance of plagiarism was a careless mistake. Professor Boots believed the instance to have been the result of procrastination and was intended academic theft. Dora expressed that she did look at the article and that she would take full responsibility for relying on it too heavily without citation, but that she had not intended on such. In talking with the student, the Honor Board felt that Dora did not understand the definitions of plagiarism and were concerned with Dora's thought and writing process- especially given that the student was already a junior. By end of the

conversation Dora failed to see how following an author's structure and using his arguments for her reflection was wrong.

The Honor Board resolved that Dora receive a 0.0 on the assignment in question, re-write assignment to demonstrate she has taken the Honor Board's suggestions about honest writing into consideration, and write a 3-5 page guide directing proper scientific writing with a focus on plagiarism and citation for the Honor Board to be submitted the beginning of the next semester.