

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 2014- 2015 school year. Following this report is a summary of disciplinary activity in the Dean's office.

FALL 2014

1) A junior was accused of copying solutions for a problem set in a chemistry course from the Professor's solutions from the previous year, which remained available on GLOW to students from the previous year. The student was found responsible and was sanctioned with failure in the course plus disciplinary probation for one year.

2) A junior was accused of copying solutions for a problem set in Biology from those provided in the previous year for the course. The student was found responsible, as he had clearly answered the questions from the previous year's assignment (which was not publicly available) using the solutions from that year. The committee voted to recommend a sanction of failure in the course, with one semester of disciplinary probation.

3) A senior was accused of submitting a paper for a class that was very substantially identical to one they submitted earlier for a different course. This is not permitted by the honor code, and in addition the directions for the papers in this course specifically stated "Plagiarism of use of a paper previously submitted for another course is a violation of the Honor Code and will be referred to the Student Honor Committee." Following the hearing, the committee voted that the student had, in fact, violated the honor code, by submitting a paper that was directly from one written for another class. The sanction was failure in the course.

4) Two juniors were accused of directly copying solutions for the homework in a Math class from one another. The syllabus stated "You may work with classmates on homework, but the write-up of homework must be your own. In particular, do not give written-up homework solutions to another student to look at. You should not look at any homework solutions until after turning in your homework." Following the hearing and deliberations, the committee determined that both students had violated the honor code by directly sharing solutions on this homework assignment. The sanction was failure in the course with one year of disciplinary probation. The committee also required that the students no longer be permitted to serve as teaching assistants in the mathematics and statistics departments. (Both students had been TAs in the past.)

5) A senior was accused of violation of the honor code by copying online solutions to problems in two problem sets for a computer science course. The committee deliberated following the hearing, and determined that the student had, in fact, violated the honor code by submitting code that had been taken directly from an internet source without any citation. They noted that the professor's syllabus very explicitly required citations in cases where a student has used an internet resource to solve a problem. It further required that students explain the extent of aid they received from that source. The committee voted in a strong majority, 5 to 2, for a sanction of failure in the course. A small minority – one student – voted for the alternative sanction of failure in the assignment. Because a formal recommendation from the committee requires a $\frac{3}{4}$ majority, which isn't quite achieved with a $\frac{5}{7}$ vote, the committee did not formally issue any recommended sanction to the dean. The dean elected to vote with the majority of the committee, and the sanction was failure in the course.

6) A senior was accused of plagiarizing material in a two papers for the same psychology course.

The Professor had observed that the second half of paper two and all of paper three contained multiple instances of verbatim wording taken from various sources. While the sources were cited, the verbatim language was not in quotation marks, making it look as if the specific descriptions and phrasing were written by the student, when in fact they were not. Following the hearing, the committee deliberated and determined that the student had, in fact, violated the honor code by taking verbatim text from sources without quotation. There were 28 significant sections of such verbatim text marked in the two papers. In addition, there was at least one place where the original source – Wikipedia – from which the student had drawn a large section of verbatim text, was not cited at all. The committee recommended a sanction of failure in the course.

7) A sophomore was accused of violating the honor code during the final exam in a History course. Two students reported that they observed what appeared to be a student checking the internet on their computer while taking the exam. Records from OIT confirmed that the student had, in fact, accessed the internet from their laptop at that time. Following the hearing, the committee deliberated and determined that the student had violated the honor code by accessing internet sources during the exam. They voted to recommend a sanction of failure in the course, with disciplinary probation for two semesters.

WINTER STUDY 2015

8) A first year student was accused of violating the honor code in the special Winter Study Course that allows a student to make up a course deficiency as well as receive Winter Study credit. The professor became concerned when the student submitted a paper that appeared not to be written for the course. Following the hearing and deliberations, the committee decided that the student had, in fact, violated the honor code, by submitting, for four of the six papers in the course, work that had been done over 18 months previously, and not for the Williams course at all. The committee voted to recommend a sanction of failure in the course with two semesters of disciplinary probation.

9) A junior was accused of plagiarism in a paper for a Winter Study course. Several sections appeared to be verbatim identical to text on various websites, although none of the material was marked by quotation marks. Additional material was very nearly verbatim, with only a word or two changed. In total, almost half of the paper fell into one of these two categories. Following the hearing and deliberations, the committee determined that the student had violated the Honor Code by including verbatim and very closely paraphrased material in a paper in a manner that made it appear those words were the student's when they were not. The committee voted to recommend a sanction of failure in the course.

SPRING 2015

10) Four first-year students were accused of violation of the honor code by collaborating on a take home exam in a statistics course. Collaboration was explicitly forbidden on this exam. The committee recommended that all four students receive the sanction of failure in the course.

11) A senior was accused of plagiarism in a paper for a public health course. Several sentences in the paper that were drawn very closely – either verbatim or verbatim with one or two small word changes – from the work of another author. Following the hearing, the committee voted that the student did, indeed, violate the honor code, by failing to cite the ideas, words and phrases of another person where they appeared in the paper. The committee voted to apply a sanction of failure in the course. However, after discussion with the professor the dean decided to impose the lesser sanction of failure in the assignment, resulting in a zero for 20% of the course grade.

12) A sophomore was accused of plagiarism in a paper for a history course. The paper contained four major sections which were taken verbatim, or nearly so, from sources that the student had not cited,

credited, or referenced in any way. The student argued that they had never written a college paper before, and were totally unaware that what they were doing was wrong, as it was common practice in their high school. Following the hearing and deliberations, the committee voted that the student did violate the honor code by plagiarizing the work of others. They voted to recommend a sanction of failure in the assignment.

13) Two sophomores were accused of copying one another's drawings for and portions of a related paper for an art history course. After hearing from both students and the professor, the committee determined that one student had texted the other and asked him to send a photo of his drawing. The first student then used that photo of the second student's drawing in creating their submitted work. The committee determined that this was collaboration beyond what was permitted in the course, especially as there was no attribution. The committee was split between a vote of failure in the course or failure in the assignment. The dean decided to assign the sanction of failure in the assignment.

14) A sophomore was accused of violating the honor code in an environmental studies course, by pretending to have submitted a paper that had, in fact, not been completed or submitted. The paper submitted on GLOW on the due date was in fact not a paper, but actually another document. Before contacting the Honor Committee, the professor tried for several days to contact the student by email to let them know that they had not submitted the paper and to ask them to submit it immediately. The student explained to the committee what had taken place – that they had submitted the theatre lab application as a “place holder”, hoping to buy time to submit the real paper later, while still receiving credit for handing it in on time. The committee found the student responsible for a violation of the honor code. They voted to recommend a sanction of failure in the course.

15) A senior was accused of using online sources during a take home exam for a math course. The statement from the Professor on the exam said explicitly that, while the exam was open book for course materials, no other internet sources could be used. The professor explained that she became concerned when she realized that the solutions to one part of the exam seemed not to have show the work that would have been needed in order to obtain them. She found also that the solutions were very similar to those available in an open online reference. The committee determined that the student had violated the Honor Code by using a solution in the exam that was taken from the internet, without citation and in a manner explicitly forbidden by the Professor. They voted to recommend a sanction of failure in the course.

16) A junior was accused of plagiarism in two papers for a Japanese course. Following the hearing and deliberations, the committee found that the student was responsible for violating the Honor code by including extensive verbatim text without quotation or citation in two papers. The committee voted to recommend a sanction of failure in the course.

17) Four first year students were accused of collaboration in a take-home exam for a statistics course. Following the hearing and deliberations, the committee determined that the students had, in fact, violated the Honor Code by seeking and using information from one another student in the class during a take home exam, in a manner explicitly prohibited by the exam rules. The committee voted to recommend a sanction of failure in the course for all four students. One student also received a sanction of disciplinary probation.

18) A senior was accused of violations of the honor code in the problem sets for a physics course. Following the hearing and deliberations, the committee determined that the student had violated the Honor Code in this course by taking the homework of another student from a box in the physics building and using it to write out their own solutions for multiple problem sets over the course of the term. This was a second honor code violation for this student. The committee recommended a sanction of failure in the course, with a two-year suspension from the College.

19) Two sophomores were accused of violating the honor code during the final exams for two computer science courses in which they were both enrolled. Both exams were take home exams, with clearly articulated requirements under the Honor Code to share no information with other students. Following the hearing and deliberations, the committee found one student responsible for using the work (exam notes or drafts) of the other student in completing final exams for both courses. The committee voted to recommend a sanction of failure in the course in both courses for this student, with disciplinary probation until graduation.

The student who provided the solutions was also found responsible for two violations of the honor code. In one class, this student was found responsible for providing material (including notes on answers) to another student for a take home final exam. In the other class, this student was found responsible for failing to dispose of or submit to the professor his notes on solutions from the exam. Submitting your scratch paper with the exam this second course was explicitly required by the Professor. The committee voted to recommend a sanction of failure in the course in the first course. For the second course, the Committee vote did not meet the 3/4 majority required to recommend a sanction. In that case the decision on sanction falls to the dean, who elected to support the majority view of the committee and impose a sanction of one year of Disciplinary Probation.

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 one disciplinary case, in which a student appealed a sanction of suspension pushing a Campus Safety and Security officer at a party so hard that the officer fell. The student appealed the sanction, stating that his actions were accidental. The committee voted to impose a sanction of disciplinary probation with service to the college community.

DISCIPLINARY SANCTIONS ASSIGNED BY THE DEAN'S OFFICE

For the 2014-2015 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 sexual assault.

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, sexual exploitation, and dangerous drug manufacture in a dormitory with dealing.

Two students were placed on disciplinary probation, and two 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 56 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.