

The Honor and Discipline Committee reports to the College each year about the nature of the cases it has heard, the judgments made, and the penalties it has determined. This report covers the meetings of the committee that reviewed cases during the 2012-2013 school year. Following this report is a summary of disciplinary activity in the Dean's office.

HONOR CODE CASES

1. A sophomore was accused using extensive material from SparkNotes in a paper, without citation or attribution of any kind. The student argued that he had done nothing wrong, stating that he had read SparkNotes but that the discussion in the paper was entirely his own, and also that the paper submitted was not his final draft. The committee felt this explanation was insufficient in two ways. First, the Honor code applies to all work submitted, whether final draft or not. Second, the discussion in the student's paper exactly followed that in SparkNotes, sentence by sentence, idea by idea, which made it highly unlikely that the student had generated it without some significant intellectual debt to SparkNotes, which thus needed to be acknowledged. The sanction was failure in the course, with disciplinary probation for two semesters.
2. A junior was accused of several dishonest actions relative to a paper. First, it appeared the majority of the paper was taken verbatim from a website without citation. Second, the student attempted several times to deceive the professor when he realized he had accidentally shared information that made it very likely that his plagiarism would be discovered. The student readily admitted that this was what he had done. The sanction was failure in the course with disciplinary probation of one semester.
3. A first year student was accused of using some wording and arguments from SparkNotes in a paper without citation or reference. The student explained that some of the language in question came from class discussion. He also explained that he had read SparkNotes after reading the original source, in order to be best prepared for class and to write the paper, as he had been taught to do in high school. Ultimately, the student and the committee came to agree that the reading of SparkNotes had influenced his thinking and ideas as he wrote the paper, and thus should have been cited, so that a violation of the Honor Code did take place. However, the Committee felt that the issues with the paper arose out of a genuine misunderstanding of what it means to "use" the work of a source, and therefore the need to cite that source. As a result, the committee assigned a sanction of failure in the assignment rather than failure in the course.
4. A sophomore was accused of two violations of the honor code in the writing of a paper for a language course; first, using without any attribution an outside source (native speaker) for help with wording and grammar when the syllabus explicitly said that any such help must be fully cited, and second, using online sources in the paper without referencing them in any way. The committee found the student

- guilty of both of these acts in violation of the honor code, and assigned a sanction of failure in the course with two semesters of disciplinary probation.
5. A sophomore was accused of using ideas, language, and direct quotation from a book in a paper without citation or quotation. The student explained that this was unintentional, a result of writing the paper in a hurry and on his phone. He acknowledged that this approach had led to taking credit for words and ideas that were not his own. The committee assigned a sanction of failure in the course.
 6. A first year student was accused of using the Instructor's Solution Manual in completing many of the homework assignments for a course. The student agreed that he had used this manual, in explicit violation of the rules of the course. The Committee assigned a sanction of failure in the course with disciplinary probation for two semesters.
 7. A senior was accused of violating the honor code by using verbatim language and close paraphrases, without any quotation or citation, from several article abstracts in creating an annotated bibliography. The student agreed that she had done so, but said that she had thought that this was acceptable in an annotated bibliography. The committee was not compelled by this argument, and assigned a sanction of failure in the course.
 8. A sophomore was accused of taking a solution from an online source and using it to answer a question in a take home exam, in explicit violation of the rules for the exam. The student agreed that he had done so. The committee assigned a sanction of failure in the course.
 9. A first year student was accused of using a variety of internet sources – both verbatim and by close paraphrase – in a paper without citation of any kind. The use of internet sources was forbidden for this paper. The student agreed that she had used these sources without citation, in knowing violation of the honor code. The committee assigned a sanction of failure in the course.
 10. A sophomore was accused of taking a solution from an online source and using it to answer a question in a take home exam, in explicit violation of the rules for the exam. The student agreed that he had done so. The committee assigned a sanction of failure in the course.
 11. A first year student was accused of taking and copying the test of another student, nearly in its entirety. This was an exceptionally serious violation not only of the honor code, but also of the space and property of the other student and of the professor. The committee assigned a sanction of failure in the course with suspension for one semester plus winter study.
 12. A sophomore was accused of including large chunks of uncited, verbatim prose from on line sources in her paper. She agreed that she had done so, feeling

- pressured to “pad” the paper out to its required length. The committee assigned a sanction of failure in the course with two semesters of disciplinary probation.
13. A junior was accused of extensive use of an online resource in a paper, with no reference or citation of any kind. The student argued that he had developed the arguments himself, before looking at the online resource. The committee was not compelled by this argument, because the match between the online resource and the student’s paper was so exact and extensive. The committee assigned a sanction of failure in the course, with two semesters of disciplinary probation.
 14. A sophomore was accused of taking a solution from an online source and using it to answer a question in a take home exam, in explicit violation of the rules for the exam. The student agreed that he had done so. The committee assigned a sanction of failure in the course.
 15. A first year student was accused of attempting to deceive a professor regarding handing in a paper. Specifically, the student was accused of claiming to turn a paper in to the professor’s mail box when he had not, in fact, done so. The student strongly argued that he had turned the paper in, but a large body of evidence suggested that could not possibly be the case. The committee assigned a sanction of failure in the course with three semesters of disciplinary probation.
 16. A student was accused of using verbatim language from a source in a paper without quotation marks. The source was, however, cited at the end of each verbatim sentence. The committee found that this was a violation of the honor code, as the absence of quotation marks made it appear that the language and phrasing were the work of the student, when in fact they were those of the author. However, as the citation of the source was extensive and omnipresent, the committee assigned a sanction of failure in the assignment only.
 17. A first year student was accused of violating the honor code by using verbatim and nearly verbatim ideas, phrases, and sentences from an outside source with no citation or reference whatsoever. The student admitted to reading the source, but said he had not cited it because he had not used it significantly in writing his paper. The committee was not convinced that this was the case, as multiple sentences seemed to be taken directly from the source with no attribution. They assigned a sanction of failure in the course, with one semester of disciplinary probation.
 18. A first year student was accused of violating the honor code by using multiple internet sources without citation in writing a lab report. The student described a difficult first semester and a loss of confidence, and fully acknowledged that he had consciously copied material for the lab report in violation of the honor code. The committee assigned a sanction of failure in the course.

19. A junior was accused of violating the honor code by turning in the same work for credit in two courses. The honor code clearly states “Even the use of a student’s own previous or concurrent work must be acknowledged; thus, a student must obtain the prior permission of all instructors concerned before submitting substantially all or part of the same paper in more than one course.” The committee assigned a sanction of failure in only one of the two courses.
20. A sophomore was accused of using extensive verbatim quotes from several online sources, with no citation, in a paper. The student readily admitted that she had done so. The committee assigned a sanction of failure in the course.
21. A junior was accused of using an online source to solve a problem on a take home exam. The committee did not find clear and convincing evidence that this had taken place. The student was found not guilty of violation of the honor code.
22. A junior was accused of dishonesty regarding the turning in of work. Specifically, he was accused of claiming to have submitted work electronically when it had not, in fact, been turned in. The committee did not find clear and convincing evidence that this had taken place. The student was found not guilty of violating the honor code.
23. A sophomore was accused of using an online source to solve a problem on a take home exam. The committee did not find clear and convincing evidence that this had taken place. The student was found not guilty of violation of the honor code.
24. A sophomore was accused of violating the honor code by copying the paper of another student. The student readily admitted that he had done so. This infraction came on top of other non-academic violations of the code of conduct that had resulted in the student being on disciplinary probation. The student was failed in the course, and also suspended for one semester. The student whose paper was copied was found not to have known his work was being used in this manner, and so he was found not guilty of any honor code infraction.
25. A junior was accused of violating the honor code by including very close paraphrases of published work in her paper with no citation or reference whatsoever indicating that the ideas and words were those of others. The student was assigned a sanction of failure in the course.
26. A first year student was accused of violating the honor code by including in his paper long sections taken verbatim from Wikipedia without citation or reference of any kind. The student agreed that he had done so, and was found guilty. The committee assigned a sanction of failure in the course with two semesters of disciplinary probation.
27. A sophomore was accused of violating the honor code by submitting a paper containing extensive quotations and paraphrases from a variety of websites,

- without any citation. The student agreed that she had submitted a paper that contained plagiarism due to the absence of necessary citations, however she said this had occurred because she had accidentally submitted an early draft rather than the final version. The committee was not convinced that the evidence supported this assertion. The student was found guilty of violating the honor code. Because this was a second violation, the committee assigned a sanction of failure in the course plus suspension for one year.
28. A junior was accused of using the solution manual to complete multiple homework problems, in violation of the explicit rules of the course. The student was found guilty and the committee assigned a sanction of failure in the course.
 29. A first year student was accused of violating the honor code by including in her paper multiple verbatim phrases and paraphrased ideas from an online source without citation or reference of any kind. The student commented that this had taken place due to her writing process, in which she typically started with quotations from secondary sources which are unmarked, and then wrote around them, with a plan to fix all the references up at the end. The student and the committee agreed that this was a very high-risk approach, which a large probability of leaving some plagiarized material in the paper. The student was found guilty and assigned a sanction of failure in the course.
 30. A first year student was accused of violating the honor code by including a number of sentences in an annotated bibliography that were taken verbatim from online book descriptions, without citation or reference. The student was assigned a sanction of failure in the course.
 31. A senior was accused of dishonesty regarding the turning in of written work for a course. She said she had handed in work in the professor's box when she had not done so, and misdirected the professor multiple times in an attempt to cover her tracks. The committee considered a sanction of suspension, but ultimately assigned a sanction of failure in the course with one year of disciplinary probation. The student did not graduate with her class.

In addition to these hearings, twenty cases were brought to the attention of the Faculty and Student chair that did not, ultimately, go to a hearing. Typically in these cases either someone had been heard talking about cheating but that person could not be identified, or there was a concern regarding student work that turned out to be a problem with the work that was not covered by the honor code.

DISCIPLINARY CASES HEARD BY THE COMMITTEE

The committee heard three disciplinary cases. Two of these were appeals of the decision of the Deans, and a third case was sent to the committee directly without an initial decision by the Dean.

- (1) Sexual assault (appeal.) The committee determined a sanction of expulsion.
- (2) Sexual assault (appeal.) The committee determined a sanction of three semesters suspension.
- (3) Lying to the Registrar regarding having permission from a professor, for a student with a previous record of Disciplinary Probation. The committee determined a sanction of one semester suspension.

DISCIPLINARY SANCTIONS ASSIGNED BY THE DEAN'S OFFICE

For the 2012-2013 academic year, there were fourteen formal disciplinary actions taken for non-academic violations of the code of conduct.

The Dean's office expelled one student for interactions with students and staff over a long period of time that were dangerous in some cases and threatening in others.

The Dean's office suspended four students for durations of one to two and a half years for violations of the college's code of conduct. The offenses included sexual assault, other forms of injury to others, and willful destruction of property.

Five students were placed on disciplinary probation, and four received written warnings regarding their actions.

The Deans' Office and Security Department conduct initial discussions with students about underage drinking and marijuana smoking; these discussions are not a part of the students' disciplinary record. There were 51 such discussions involving the Dean's office. In many cases these discussions are followed by referrals to a Health Educator.

The Dean's office also conducts conversations over minor disciplinary concerns with students that do not rise to the level of requiring formal action.