

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 2015- 2016 school year. Following this report is a summary of disciplinary activity in the Dean's office.

- 1) A junior was brought to the committee due to concerns about using material taken directly from a website in preparing answers for a lab assignment. Following the hearing and deliberations, the committee determined that the student had violated the honor code by copying sentences directly from a source and using them in an assignment without citation. The committee voted to recommend a sanction of failure in the assignment.
- 2) A sophomore was brought to the committee due to concerns about using material from an online source in a paper without citation. The professor noticed that some of the paragraphs seemed to be written in a different style from the rest. Upon investigation online, the professor found several sentences taken nearly verbatim from an online source. Following the hearing and deliberations, the committee found the student responsible for violating the honor code for taking material from an online source without quotation or citation and recommended a sanction of failure in the course.
- 3) A senior was brought to the committee due to concerns about copying a classmate's work on an exam. The professor found that the student's exam was strikingly similar to that of another student (using verbatim language on one problem and identical equations/layout on another). Following the hearing and deliberations, the committee found the student guilty of copying from another student during an in-class exam, and voted to recommend a sanction of failure in the course with disciplinary probation until graduation.
- 4) A senior was brought to the committee due to concerns about plagiarizing portions of a paper. The professor observed that the paper had no in-text citations whatsoever, despite having multiple figures, factual details and arguments that were clearly gleaned from outside sources. Following the hearing and deliberations, the committee voted that the student had violated the honor code by taking verbatim text and paraphrased facts from a variety of sources without citation. Although there was no proper citation within the paper, the student did include a list of the websites used in the paper at the end and explained that due to some significant personal challenges, there was no time to properly attribute sources within the paper. The student was sanctioned with failure in the assignment.
- 5) A senior was brought to the committee due to concerns about copying homework material from a classmate. A course TA observed that the student's homework was essentially identical to that of another student. At the hearing, it became clear that the classmate completed the assignment independently and then explained it to the student while showing the complete work. The committee agreed that the student violated the honor code by copying the completed problem set of another student while collaborating with them. Although the student acknowledged working with a classmate on the assignment itself, there was no attempt to re-word or re-write the classmate's work. The committee was convinced that the student genuinely did not perceive the interaction with the classmate as going beyond the bounds of the collaboration encouraged by the professor. As a result, they voted for a sanction of failure in the homework section of the course.
- 6) A first year student was brought to the committee due to concerns about cheating on an exam. The professor noticed that there were multiple problems in which the student had either written down the right answer without showing any work, or written down the right answer along with work that was inconsistent with that answer. The professor was concerned about how the student could have arrived at these answers without using an outside source, and also noticed

that the answers the student provided on the exam were identical to those one would get by typing the question into a free app on a smartphone. Following the hearing and extensive deliberations, the committee found the student responsible for a violating the honor code by using an outside resource on a closed-book exam for which no calculators, cellphones or iPods were permitted. The resulting sanction was failure in the course with one semester of disciplinary probation.

7) Two sophomores were brought to the committee due to concerns that they had used the same final presentation as part of their graded work in two separate courses. At the hearing, it became clear that the work done for one class was largely recycled and then used again in order to receive credit for a second assignment in an entirely different course. The committee found both students guilty of violating the honor code for “submitting substantially similar work in two separate courses without reference or consent.” The committee voted on a sanction of failure in the sanction, along with one semester of disciplinary probation.

8) A sophomore was brought to the committee due to concerns about copying portions of a lab report. The professor initially noticed that the student’s write-up included references to sources that were used last year (rather than this year). The professor also observed that the student’s write up was substantially similar to, and in some places verbatim identical to, a lab report written last spring by the student’s tutor. After the hearing and substantial deliberations, the Honor Committee found the student responsible for violating the honor code by submitting a lab write-up that contained sections plagiarized from another student. The committee voted to recommend a sanction of failure in the course.

9) Two sophomores were brought to the committee due to concerns about cheating on a take-home exam. The professor observed that the two exams were very similar to one another in ways that were distinct from the exams of other students. Following the hearing and deliberations, the honor committee found that the two students had collaborated on the exam, despite the fact that collaboration was explicitly prohibited by the professor. The committee voted to recommend a sanction of failure in the course.

10) A senior was brought to the committee due to concerns about plagiarism. The professor noticed that portions of a paper seemed to be drawn verbatim (or very closely paraphrased) from sources without quotation or citation. Following the hearing and deliberations, the committee found that the student had violated the honor code by plagiarizing parts of the paper, and recommended a sanction of failure in the course.

11) A sophomore was brought to the committee due to concerns about plagiarism. The professor noted that several of the student’s response papers contained material that appeared to be taken verbatim from internet sources without citation. Following the hearing and deliberations, the committee found that that student had violated the honor code by plagiarizing material from outside sources. Due to an unusual set of circumstances presented at the hearing, the Dean of the College retroactively withdrew the student from the course.

12) A first year student was brought to the committee due to concerns about using online material to complete a homework assignment. The professor noticed that the homework, which the student submitted after the solutions had been posted on GLOW, was nearly identical to those solutions. After hearing the case and deliberating, the Honor Committee found that the student had violated the honor code by copying the solutions and submitting them for credit. The committee recommended a sanction of failure in the homework portion of the grade for this course.

13) A junior was brought to the committee due to concerns about using online material to complete a homework assignment. The professor noticed that the student's answer to one of the questions appeared to be essentially identical to that on a website. After the hearing and deliberations, the committee found the student responsible for violation of the honor code by copying an online solution into homework, without making any note or reference that the work had not been done independently. The committee voted to recommend a sanction of failure in the course.

14) A sophomore was brought to the committee due to concerns about plagiarism. The professor became aware that several parts of the paper were drawn word-for-word from internet sources, including a page-long section. Following the hearing and deliberations, the committee found the student responsible for violating the honor code by including material from internet sources in a paper without proper citation or quotation, and voted to recommend a sanction of failure in the course.

15) A senior was brought to the committee due to concerns about plagiarism. Two professors in a team taught course note passages in the student's paper that reminded them of the Sparknotes for the book under discussion. Upon looking more closely, they found that multiple passages, choices of phrase, and arguments appeared to come directly from Sparknotes. Following the Honor Committee's hearing and deliberations, they determined that the student had violated the honor code by using verbatim phrases, close paraphrases and ideas from Sparknotes without any attribution or citation. The committee voted to recommend a sanction of failure in the course.

16) A sophomore was brought to the committee due to concerns about copying lab assignments. The professor noticed that the student's answers for one pre-lab exercise as well as another post-lab exercise bore an unusual and striking similarity to the answer key provided to TAs for the course. The similarities included unusual wording and explanations with a level of specificity and conciseness that students do not ordinarily produce. At the hearing, the student acknowledged requesting solutions from another student, who responded to that request with solutions that turned out to come directly from the TA manual. Following the hearing and deliberations, the committee voted that the student had violated the Honor Code by soliciting and using the completed answers of another student (with no acknowledgment or citation) in completing a lab exercise submitted for credit. The committee voted to recommend a sanction of no credit for any part of the copied lab assignments.

17) A senior was brought to the committee due to concerns about plagiarism. The professor noticed that the paper did not really speak to the primary questions raised in the course. In addition, some of the language seemed similar to what would be found in a governmental brief. After Googling phrases in the paper, the professor found an entire paragraph that came verbatim from an online source. While the source was cited in the paper, the verbatim text did not include any quotation marks or other indication that the ideas, and specific language were not independent work. The professor also found multiple phrases, and sentences taken verbatim from the same source, woven together and interspersed throughout the student's paper. Finally, the professor found material taken verbatim from a second source, which was not cited at all in the paper. Following the hearing and deliberations, the committee found the student guilty of violating the Honor Code by using materials from an external source – both verbatim and closely paraphrased, without quotation or proper citation. The committee voted to recommend a sanction of failure in the course.

18) A sophomore self-reported having misrepresented work in 5 previous courses. The student indicated that the misrepresentation of work took several forms, including using ideas from an online source without citation in a final essay, turning in a paper that had originally been written and turned in for a previous course, and using books and online sources to find answers on several take-home

exams which precluded the use of outside sources. After hearing the case and deliberating, the Honor Committee found the student violated the honor code in all of these cases. Although such violations would ordinarily be sanctioned with failure in the course, the committee wanted to acknowledge the fact that the student chose to come forward and accept responsibility for these violations without any external pressure. The student was never caught, and thus it is highly unlikely that they would have faced any consequences for the violations had they not taken the unusual step of admitting their behavior to their professors. For this reason, the committee chose the unusual lesser sanction of assigning failure in all of the relevant assignments, and recalculation of final grades in those courses.

In addition to these hearings, several 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 two disciplinary cases. In one case, a student appealed a sanction of suspension received after impersonating another student on a social media platform. The committee voted to uphold the original decision of a sanction of suspension from the College for 2 years.

In the second case, the committee heard a case in which a student falsified a transcript. The committee voted to sanction the student with a 2-year suspension from the College.

DISCIPLINARY SANCTIONS ASSIGNED BY THE DEAN'S OFFICE

For the 2015-2016 academic year, there were 7 formal disciplinary actions taken for non-academic violations of the code of conduct.

The Dean's office suspended one student for 3 semesters and another student for 2 semesters for violations of the College's code of conduct with regard to drug possession and dealing. Five students were placed on disciplinary probation due to infractions involving drugs, alcohol, and property damage.

An additional 134 students received warnings about minor disciplinary concerns, unregistered parties, underage drinking, and marijuana use. These warnings are not a part of the students' disciplinary record, but may be followed by referrals to a Health Educator.

For information about disciplinary sanctions in response to gender-based violence and sexual misconduct, please click [here](#).