

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 2013-2014 school year. Following this report is a summary of disciplinary activity in the Dean's office.

HONOR CODE CASES

- 1) A senior and a sophomore were accused of collaboration in a computer science assignment beyond the manner permitted in the course. Both students were able to demonstrate that the unusual method used in their homework was one they had learned in a previous course, rather than one they had taken from each other. The students were found not guilty of violation of the Honor Code.
- 2) Three sophomores were accused of violating the Honor code by collaborating on a take-home exam in Statistics. The students stated that they had helped one another with using a plotting program to make plots for the exam, but not assisted one another in other ways. The students were found responsible for a violation of the Honor Code because no collaboration of any kind was permitted in this exam, and using the program was one of the skills the students were expected to demonstrate. The students received a sanction of failure on the exam.
- 3) A first year student was found to have violated the Honor Code by submitting a required paper draft for an English course to the professor which contained very extensive verbatim sections taken directly from online sources with no citation or reference. Following the hearing and deliberations, the committee determined that the student had violated the honor code by submitting work that contained the ideas, words, and phrases of others with no citation or acknowledgement. The sanction was failure in the course.
- 4) A senior was found to have violated the Honor Code in an Environmental Studies course, by submitting an annotated bibliography that contained extensive verbatim sections from sources without quotation marks or citation. The sanction was failure in the course.
- 5) A sophomore was accused of pretending to hand in paper electronically when he had not actually done so. In the hearing, the student was able to demonstrate that he had written the paper and submitted it in an atypical, but not deceptive, way. The student was found not guilty of violating the Honor Code.
- 6) A first year student was found to have submitted a paper for a Sociology course in which there was a paragraph that seemed to be ill-matched to the rest of the essay. Upon investigation, the professor found that the entire paragraph was a direct quote (every word of the paragraph was an exact match) for a paragraph in a source the student had found on line. The student was a first year student from a high school abroad in which citation was not taught at all. The sanction was failure in the paper.
- 7) A first year student gave a presentation for an English class in which the professor became concerned that the student was reading an analysis of the text that was not his own. After class the student handed the professor a set of notes for the presentation that were taken verbatim from an online source, but that had no references or quotation marks. When the professor asked the student the student had violated the honor code by presenting material verbatim from an online source without any reference to the source and without fully indicating that the material was not his own. The sanction was failure in the course.

8) A senior, a junior and a first year student were found to have submitted final exams for an Astronomy course. The students said that the senior and junior had copied solutions provided to them by the first year student. All three students were sanctioned with failure in the course.

9) A senior came before the honor committee as a result of issues with the timing of a paper submission for an Economics class. The student claimed to have submitted the paper on time, but that was not the case. (And, the professor did not receive the paper until three days after the due date.) The student had been dishonest with the professor in order to gain extra time to complete the work. The honor committee found the student guilty of violating the honor code by lying about the status of a paper and the time at which it was submitted in order to gain academic advantage. The sanction was failure in the course.

10) Two juniors were found to have submitted oddly similar answers in a lab report and on a take-home final exam in a Psychology course. In the hearing the students explained that they had, indeed, worked together on both the lab and the exam, however they suggested that collaboration was not substantial. The committee determined that they did violate the honor code by soliciting and receiving specific advice from one another student during a take home exam, and also by exchanging written work on a laboratory report in violation of the stated rules of the course. The sanction was failure in the course for both students with two semesters of disciplinary probation for the student who solicited answers on the final exam, and one semester of disciplinary probation for the student who provided those answers.

11) Two first year students were found to have collaborated on the take home portion of a final exam for statistics. Both were sanctioned with failure in the course.

12) A senior was found to have submitted a paper for a sociology course that was essentially identical to a paper he had written for a WGSS course earlier a few days earlier. The committee voted that he had violated the honor code by submitting a paper for a course that had (almost entirely) already been submitted for another course, with neither permission from the instructors nor acknowledgment that the paper came from one written for another course. The sanction was failure in the sociology course.

13) A senior was found to have submitted a paper which suggested that he had read a primary source which he had not, in fact, seen. This is a violation of the Honor Code. The case was appealed and the student was able to prove that they had, in fact, accessed the primary source. The student was then found not guilty.

14) A first year student was found to have violated the Honor Code in a computer science course, by using the final project of another student, without attribution and against the rules of the course, to produce his own final project. The student also submitted emails to the professors about his work on the final project that were, at best, misleading. The sanction was failure in the course.

15) A first year student and a sophomore were found guilty of violating the honor code by conferring with one another during and in-class exam in Statistics, despite the Professor's specific instructions to the contrary. The sanction was failure in the course for both students, with disciplinary probation for one semester for the student who initiated the exchange.

16) A junior was found responsible for violating the Honor Code by submitting a paper for a sociology course that contained an extensive quotation from an external source that was not marked by quotation marks. This portion of the paper was referenced to the correct author but not to the correct page. The committee felt that the fact that the quotation came directly from the source that you cited at the end of the line (though with the wrong page number) suggested that the student had not intended to plagiarize the words, but instead had forgotten to mark them as a quotation. As a result, they recommended a sanction of only a letter of warning, rather than failure in the course, which is the most typical sanction even for unintended plagiarism.

17) A first year student was found responsible for violating the honor code by submitting a history paper that contained sentences and quotations from an online source (Wikipedia) without any citation or quotation. This was the student's second honor code violation. They were sanctioned with failure in the course with one semester of suspension from the college.

18) A first year student was found responsible for violation of the honor code for submitting a paper that included ideas presented as his own that were actually drawn from footnotes of a text for the course. In the hearing, the student explained that he had carefully read all of the text, including the footnotes, but had done so several weeks before writing the paper. He stated that, while writing the paper, he had understood these ideas to be his own, having forgotten from whence they were drawn.

The committee made the unusual decision to assign only a failure in the assignment, because some felt that he genuinely was unaware that the ideas had their origin outside of his own thinking.

19) A sophomore was found to have violated the Honor Code by using the answers of another student to complete her work on a take-home exam in Chemistry, and also by submitting an incorrect time log on the exam. The sanction was failure in the course with disciplinary probation until graduation.

20) A senior was found to have violated the honor code by plagiarizing a portion of a paper for a history course. In reading the paper, the professor became aware that many sentences seemed to reflect writing he was familiar with from the literature. In looking into this matter, the professor found that long sections of the paper were taken directly from a variety of online sources, without any reference or citation. The sanction was failure in the course. The student did not graduate with his class.

21) A senior was found responsible for violating the honor code for logging into the course Glow site while taking a closed-book final exam for a math course. Glow records were not conclusive as regards whether the student in fact opened any resource files. She claimed that she did not, and her exam did not show signs of solutions having been drawn from the online resources. The committee recommended a sanction of failure in the final exam.

22) A first year student was found responsible for violating the Honor Code by logging into several folders on Glow during a closed book math final, although no use of notes or other materials was permitted. The student agreed that he had done so, and his exam showed evidence that he had copied some solutions from the ones on Glow. The sanction was failure in the course, with disciplinary probation for one semester at Williams.

23) A sophomore was found responsible for violating the honor code by logging into the "handout" folder on Glow during a closed-book math final exam, although no use of notes or other materials was permitted. The student appeared not to have used the materials in writing out her answers, however, she had been found responsible for violation of the honor code in a previous semester. The sanction was failure in the course, with disciplinary probation through graduation from Williams.

24) A first year student was found responsible for violating the honor code by logging into several folders on Glow during a closed book math final exam, although no use of notes or other materials was permitted. The student did use the materials to answer one question. The sanction was failure in the course with one semester of disciplinary probation.

25) A senior was found responsible for violating the honor code by using verbatim and paraphrased material in a final paper without proper citation. The committee was convinced by the structure and referencing in

the rest of the paper that the student had intended to mark the verbatim portion with quotations but had forgotten to do so. The sanction was failure in the paper.

26) A junior was found responsible for violation of the Honor Code by including in multiple instances material drawn verbatim from sources without citation or quotation in several philosophy papers written for the Williams Oxford program. The committee voted to recommend a sanction of failure in the course, with disciplinary probation for one year.

27) A junior was found to have violated the honor code by including several figures in a physics paper without citation. In the hearing, the student demonstrated that he had completed the paper after giving the related presentations, and went over to the computer lab to work on the references and print it out. He explained that you got into an extended conversation with a friend, and became distracted, then printed out the paper and turned it in, forgetting that you had not done the work on the references that needed doing. The dean was aware of extreme and extraordinary circumstances affecting this student. As a result, the sanction was failure (a grade of 0) on the paper, rather than failure in the course.

28) A sophomore student was found to have inadvertently learned about the existence of one item on a final anthropology exam from another sophomore student before taking the exam. The committee determined that the student had violated the honor code by receiving information about an item on the exam before taking the exam, and not alerting the professor that that was the case. The sanction for this student was a letter of warning, and additionally assigning zero points for the particular item in question on the exam.

The student who had shared information had taken the exam early, and had been warned by the professor very explicitly not to speak about the exam with anyone. In the hearing, the student expressed that he was aware of the professor's strong warning about not talking with others about the exam as he was talking with the other student in the course. He explained that he had borrowed her notes and was feeling very grateful that she had shared them with him, so that when she asked "were my notes adequate?" he felt you should be helpful to her. He made clear to the committee that you was trying to be helpful without violating the professor's warning, trying to be vague yet supportive. The committee believed that he did not intend to violate the professor's expectation, and indeed that this situation might well be described as "small talk gone bad". Nevertheless, it was clear that the Professor's requirement that no information about the exam be shared with those who had not taken it was not fully upheld. The sanction assigned was a loss of 10 points on the final exam.

29) A first year student was found responsible for violating the honor code in two ways: by copying language, arguments and ideas from sources without citation, and by improperly citing sources he had not seen or read. Both of these issues occurred in papers for a history class. The sanction was failure in the course with one semester of disciplinary probation.

30) A first year student was found to have violated the honor code in his final paper for an Environmental Studies course, which contained a section with several verbatim sentences without quotation or citation. While the paper had a complete bibliography, it also lacked any citations within the text that would allow the reader to determine the origin of the facts, figures, and graphics. The sanction was failure in the course.

DISCIPLINARY SANCTIONS ASSIGNED BY THE DEAN'S OFFICE

For the 2013-2014 academic year, there were fifteen formal disciplinary actions taken for non-academic violations of the code of conduct.

The Dean's office expelled one student for violation of the sexual misconduct policy and of a court-ordered restraining order.

The Dean's office suspended seven students for durations of one semester to three years. The offenses included sexual assault, other forms of injury to others, drunk driving, and willful destruction of property.

Seven students were placed on disciplinary probation.

The Deans' Office and Campus Safety 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 66 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.