No reprimands to studs in 'termpaper scandal'  

T&C views today's culture  

There were other factors which contributed to Rogers' inability to confirm that plagiar- 
ism had been committed. According 
to Rogers, the conclusive evidence 
that implicated students was made difficult by 
the considerable use of false 
names; in some cases real names 
could have, been used by differ- 
ent persons. Rogers also men- 
tioned the difficulty in proving that, 
"the term papers in ques- 
tion had not been surrepti- 
tively submitted to the 
indicted subject." An article in the March 
24th issue of the Chronicle of 
Higher Education noted that 
only five students were 
identified in the implicated 
formal action could be taken "in 
the absence of the faculty 
member in question and the 
subsequent difficulty of estab-
lishing facts."  
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Therefore is the reason for 
not alleging disciplinary 
actions against the students 
involved. Students who had used 
term papers that were 
proven to have been bought from 
the companies either had their 
name submitted to the paper and/or in the 
courses to which they were sub-
mitted lowered one notch, or 
were given a grade of F on the 
papers and/or in the courses. 
The official added that many of the 
students whose names were found on the company lists had 
their grade lowered before the university 
tried to contact them. The of-
ficial also pointed out that the 
number of students involved 
in the scandal was not 
identified.  

In order to avoid manpower 
limitations, Ecology Action this 
year continued to use a private 
company, Metropolitan Ecology 
Workshop, to do the collecting 
and recycling. This company is 
not paid to pick up the paper; 
they make what profit they 
can on selling the paper. 

The company will haul the 
paper, compact it, and then 
will be bought from them, compacted, 
and shipped to a paper mill. 
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