

Abstracts AC19-AC25

Professor Everdeen and Student Katniss in Physics AC19

Katniss was a senior in Professor Everdeen's 300-level Physics course. When Professor Everdeen received Katniss' 25 page paper assignment, he felt that out of 25 pages, 20 pages were stolen unoriginal material copied "verbatim." He had found 60 entire lines copied. He also felt that resources weren't properly identified. Professor Everdeen expected that the assignment be well researched, while still including independent original analysis and interpretation. Plagiarism was very "obvious" to Professor Everdeen. He saw inconsistencies in writing and derivations in reported formulae.

During confrontation Katniss expressed that although it seemed like material in her paper was the result of plagiarism, Katniss had no idea that what she was doing was plagiarism. Professor Everdeen felt Katniss did not understand that transcribing entire lines from books and articles and putting them into a paper for submission was wrong. The fact many of the resources were hardcover books was a bit alarming considering the student was a senior. Copying verbatim from books in a paper worth a significant amount in the course was unacceptable. Katniss commented that she could've put in a few more footnotes here and there, but Professor Everdeen was more concerned with the fact that "80%" of the ideas and work did not belong to Katniss.

Professor Everdeen stated that nowhere in the paper did Katniss distinguish her words from those of others and while she does cite lightly, she missed to cite everything she had used- including sources from which she pulled entire lines word for word. In Katniss' statement she expressed that she had put herself in a hole by pursuing a final project topic that was beyond her years. She had taken interest in a topic and that she thought she could look into and present as part of her final presentation and paper. As she worked on the assignment she realized she lacked the knowledge to understand the topic and lacked the computer skills to simulate what she had wanted. As the semester began to come to a close, Katniss realized that her topic could not be presented in the model she was reading so heavily up on. She had to abandon that path and then pursue other leads. She had tried to meet with Professor Everdeen, but he had a very packed schedule as the semester was ending.

At the hearing Katniss thanked Professor Everdeen for being so kind and helpful throughout the course. Katniss had no intention of passing off the submitted work as her own. She saw this paper as an opportunity to explore an unfamiliar idea and she did so by gathering information from everywhere that she could. When Katniss sat down to complete her final draft for submission, she noted that the prompt

for the class said that the submitted paper had to discuss original research. Professor Everdeen explained that he did not require original research, but that it was one of the suggested options. He was particularly concerned considering Katniss was a double major in Physics and Comparative Literature. As a senior and a double major in these fields, he could not see why Katniss failed to use proper citation when she must have been doing it for so long. In addition to claiming not knowing proper citation, Professor Everdeen had pointed out he asked for a 5-10 page assignment and that Katniss chose to submit a 25 page assignment on a topic way off the grid from the ones he had suggested in the prompt. The Honor Board reviewed the assignment in question and looked at some of the articles Katniss claimed to have used and came to find she only read the abstracts of the cited works from which she copied from. *The Honor Board resolved* that Katniss receive a 0.0 in the course, record “plagiarism” on her disciplinary record, alert her current professors about the violation, and ask her current Physics professor in another course to guide her in writing another long-term literature review of 5-7 pages.

Professor Sylvester and Student Tweety in Political Science AC20

Tweety was a sophomore in Professor Sylvester’s 200-level Political Science course. In reviewing Tweety’s term paper, Professor Sylvester saw that it was not particularly well thought out and did not include the individual interpretation, analysis, and thought he had expected for the assignment. The problem was not so much the writing but in trying to figure out how Tweety had formulated her thoughts. Professor Sylvester looked at the Works Cited and did not recognize any of the resources as ones he had typically used. He then plugged the citations into his computer and could not find any of them. It seemed they were made up. Professor Sylvester contacted Tweety requesting more information on where she had found her resources and Tweety explained she had found them in the public library and she then forwarded Professor Sylvester links to library resources. Professor Sylvester looked up the links Tweety had forwarded and still could not find any of the work that was used in the submitted assignment. When approached again, Tweety admitted to creating resources and creating a story to go with them out of panic.

At the hearing Professor Sylvester explained that Tweety’s work throughout the semester was generally good, but this assignment raised flags. In trying to follow up on this assignment Professor Sylvester felt he was being led into a “wild goose chase.” Not only did Tweety create “fake” resources, but she also lied to Professor Sylvester to mislead him and waste his time. Tweety explained to the Honor Board that she had panicked as a result of having pushed work till the last minute and that she had created a story

because she had never been approached about dishonesty before. She apologized and shared she had greatly enjoyed Professor Sylvester's class and that she deeply regretted making such poor decisions. *The Honor Board resolved that Tweety receive a 0.0 on the assignment in question, have her final grade for the course capped at a 2.0, and gave her the warning that any future violation of the Honor Code could result in a harsher penalty like separation from the College. The Honor Board also recommend that Tweety take a proactive role in restoring the trust between herself and Professor Sylvester as well as the Political Science Department, especially if she planned on pursuing a major in the department.* -*The student had a second appearance in front of the Honor Board for academic dishonesty as a senior (AC43). After reviewing the materials for that case, the Honor Board felt that although Tweety had learned a great deal from the first infraction, she did not fully grasp the proper ways to use published materials in her writing and the consequences had to be more severe- even if Tweety expressed that it was a careless mistake.*

Professor Monroe and Student Marilyn in French AC21

Marilyn was a junior in Professor Monroe's 100-level French course. During finals week the Registrar had asked that Marilyn contact the Head of the Honor Board and Professor Monroe about what looked like an infraction of the Honor Code by violating Final Examination policies. Marilyn did not return her exam after the testing period had ended, and after being contacted by the Registrar about the current location of the exam, Marilyn came forward and explained she had returned it to a proctor in the next examination session because she lost time as a result of having to get additional paper since the classroom she was in ran out of blue books. The Registrar felt this was an unacceptable excuse and worth looking into by the Honor Board as every room should have had more than enough blue books and because the exam in question was in Marilyn's hand for almost 5 hours when she should have had it for the allotted 3.

At the hearing Marilyn explained to the Honor Board that there was no bad intent and that what had happened was the result of misplaced blue books and mismanaged time. Professor Monroe did not have much to comment on besides sharing with the Honor Board that Marilyn had terrible attendance- only showing up every other time- and the Marilyn had failed to turn in several papers and failed to complete 2 out of 4 exams for the course. Professor Monroe only learned of the final exam incident through the Registrar.

The Honor Board resolved that Marilyn receive a 0.0 in the course and be put on academic probation that required follow-up with her Dean and other Academic resources. Marilyn was also required to complete a reflective essay on the importance of trust and responsibility for students in the community about reading and understanding the Honor Code and what it means to live under a system of honor where trust between professors and peers is valued and expected. This reflective essay was to be sent to the Head of the Honor Board and Dean of the Undergraduate College by a specific date.

Professor Ross and Student Rachel in Chemistry AC22

Rachel was a first-year student in Professor Ross' 100-level Chemistry course. Rachel had missed a lot of class time due to a leg injury. After returning to campus, Rachel approached Professor Ross to ask about the best course of action to complete missed work which included a quiz. Professor Ross explicitly told Rachel NOT to look at the quiz answers as they were posted online on Moodle. Professor Ross checked his Moodle log to see what students were using the most to study for an upcoming exam and discovered that Rachel looked at the file with the posted quiz answers the day before she was to take it and hand it in.

Professor Ross confronted Rachel and she explained that she had clicked the file with the intent of finding out the quiz format and nothing else. When she discovered answers were posted in the file she closed it right away. Professor Ross asked Rachel to report herself to the Honor Board.

At the hearing Professor Ross expressed that regardless of whether Rachel was looking for answers or not, even the inquiry into the format of the quiz was seeking an advantage over the other students in the class- and therefore was a violation of the Honor Code. Rachel expressed that she only wanted to see the coversheet of the quiz, assuming there was one, that may have had general information about the quiz that was announced in class which she missed due to her injury. Rachel was deeply sorry and expressed that she had no intention to gain an advantage, but that she simply wanted to catch up.

The Honor Board resolved that Rachel receive a 0.0 on the quiz and be in touch with Rachel Heiser in order to develop better time management skills. She was also given the warning that any future appearances in front of the Honor Board will be looked on severely.

Professor Smith and Students Jane and Jenny in Chemistry AC23

Jane was a first-year student in Professor Smith's 100-level Chemistry course. The morning of a quiz, Jane got in touch with Professor Smith and asked to take the quiz at a later date the following week

because of a family emergency. Professor Smith had agreed. The following week Professor Smith posted the answer key for the quiz on Moodle so the rest of the class could use it as a study resource for an upcoming exam. When Jane came to pick up the quiz, Professor Smith offered she take it in his office. She expressed that she would rather take it in the library, and he allowed this. Upon grading the quiz, Professor Smith noticed that Jane's quiz answers seemed identical to the answer key available online and because of this, Professor Smith asked Jane to report herself to the Honor Board.

In his statement, Professor Smith claims that not only did Jane's quiz look almost identical to the answer key, he had an online log that showed when Jane accessed the Moodle file containing the answers. The record identified that Jane accessed the key during the allocated time Professor Smith gave her to complete the quiz. Jane denied the allegations, stating that her friend Jenny, who regularly used Jane's computer, must have accessed the answer key while she was taking the quiz. Jane expressed in her statement that for convenience her and Jenny would study together in Jane's room. Jenny would often use Jane's laptop on which Jane's Moodle was usually open. Since they both took the same chemistry course, Jenny could use Jane's Moodle when she needed to look at materials for chemistry. Jane also expressed that she was overwhelmed and that she would rather take a zero for the quiz for the sake of resolving the issue and she expressed that the Honor Board did not have to worry about future infractions since Jane intended on transferring. The Honor Board requested an additional statement from Jenny about the situation. Jenny explained in her statement that she was studying in Jane's room using Jane's laptop since Jenny was having difficulty with her own Moodle account.

After drawing upon other sources of information (i.e. tech support, and the friend who allegedly logged onto her account), the Honor Board believed Jane of intentionally cheating on her quiz, consistently lying to the Honor Board, and violating Bryn Mawr College information and privacy policies by giving her friend the password to her Moodle page. Tech support was able to track the exact date and time the quiz files were accessed and the device with which they were accessed. Jane's laptop did not consult the answer key, but a mobile device registered under Jane's name did access the file. When the Honor Board revealed this, Jane immediately denied having her phone on her person when she was taking the quiz. In addition to lying to her Professor and to the Honor Board, Jane had gotten her friend Jenny involved. Jenny was just as guilty as Jane for consistently lying to the Honor Board and to her professor. Jenny decided that helping a friend get away with academic dishonesty was more important than her own integrity and the trust between herself and the Bryn Mawr community. The Honor Board decided this was another infraction of the Honor Code and that it deserved to be evaluated as such. Jenny was

given the opportunity to write another statement if she no longer felt her original statement was valid. Jenny did just that. In her new statement Jenny admitted that she had never had access to Jane's account, Jenny never went into Jane's room and never used her laptop on the day in question. The original statement that was sent on behalf of Jenny to the Honor Board was actually composed by Jane. Jane asked that Jenny send it to the Head of the Honor Board and Jenny did.

The Honor Board resolved that Jane would receive a 0.0 for the course, apologize to Professor Smith for lying and proactively work to bridge the trust that she deliberately broke with him. A disciplinary record would be created for the student with a statement noting Jane's apparent lack of understanding in what it means to work and communicate honestly and about her disregard for responsibilities described in the College's IT policies.

-Jenny would meet separately with the Head of the Honor Board and the Dean of the Undergraduate College to decide the best way to resolve the concern over dishonesty with the Honor Board and with her professor. Jenny's second statement admitted to the dishonest actions by both Jane and Jenny. The Dean of the Undergraduate College and Head of the Honor Board resolved that since Jenny had come clean and was cooperating, that no additional hearing needed to be held. Jenny was asked to write a 2-3 page reflective piece on what the Honor Code meant and what working with integrity meant- which was to be used for future Honor Board education and Honor Board procedural review.

Professor Smith and Student Samantha in French [AC24](#)

Samantha, a Haverford senior, was enrolled in Professor Smith's senior seminar. In reviewing Samantha's final version of her senior essay Professor Smith was alarmed when he noticed that Samantha pulled direct lines from Wikipedia to define basic concepts. He asked to meet with Samantha. Immediately after Professor Smith pointed out the lines in question Samantha realized that the words on the paper were not hers and she accepted full responsibility of having plagiarized. However, when Professor Smith had asked whether Samantha had used a translator in addition to consulting Wikipedia, Samantha's first response was, "no." He asked again and she then reported she had. She then asked Professor Smith about the proper steps to take, and he asked she report herself to the Honor Board. In Samantha's statement she shared that in an attempt to complete her senior paper work on time, she became careless during the last stages before submission and failed to cite the lines in question. The plagiarized sections were new ideas that were not present in the rough drafts. She admitted to failing her

duty to give credit where credit was due, but expressed that there was no bad intention, and she was very determined to make it up to the community in whichever the Honor Board saw fit.

At the hearing Professor Smith noted that Samantha was a great student and had thoroughly cited all of her resources up til that final draft. The plagiarized lines had to have been the result of last minute carelessness. What was particularly disturbing was that the lines that were borrowed from Wikipedia were also put through an online translator. The use of an online translator for the class was expressly forbidden. Professor Smith had checked the lines in English on Wikipedia and tested them through a Google translator and came across the same sentence structure used in Samantha's paper. Samantha acknowledged that she was indeed wrong and was very cooperative during the entire scheduling and hearing process.

The Honor Board resolved that Samantha actively make note of the citation oversight at the defense of her thesis and that she request permission to add proper citation to a revised version of her senior essay. It was also recommended that Professor Smith and the other senior essay readers keep this citation oversight in mind when considering Sam's final grade in the class. The Honor Board chose to defer final judgment on grade penalty to the expertise of Professor Smith.

Professor Cyclops and Student Storm in English AC25

Storm was a first year student in Professor Cyclops' 100-level English course. In a second draft for a paper Professor Cyclops had found exact lines lifted from a published resource. While the resource was cited, the lifting of exact lines without quotation marks was unacceptable. When Professor Cyclops had confronted Storm, she immediately went on the defense saying that the published resource was included in the Works Cited and that she did manage to change a word or two in some of the many lines that were lifted- and so those lines did not constitute direct copying. Professor Smith felt Storm was missing the point since the focus of the class was academic writing, and this was a clear example of academic writing that paid no respects to the original author and the time that had gone into crafting their work. Storm said she had gone to a very good high school and that she was familiar with proper academic writing and that there was no need to move forward with reporting to the Honor Board. The next day Storm handed in another draft that was done well and to the College's standards of honest work, but Professor Cyclops was troubled that Storm still did not see that defending her original plagiarized work was a discussion still to be had.

Storm reported herself to the Honor Board and in her statement expressed that there was a lack of misunderstanding between herself and the Professor and that she was not aware of all the “rules and regulations regarding plagiarism.” In addition to not knowing what plagiarism was, Storm identified that some of the sections in question were not entirely copied. Storm also shared that she had never committed any type of plagiarism before and that she would never intentionally do so. This situation was in no way representative of her disregard for proper writing etiquette or the Bryn Mawr College Honor Code.

The Honor Board resolved that Storm receive an 0.0 for the assignment in question, as well as make regular meetings with her Dean about proper citation and incorporation of published materials. She was also encouraged to consult the Writing Center for future written work. The Honor Board also expressed that a second appearance in front of the Honor Board for academic theft or dishonesty will have severe repercussions.