Abstract discussion will be held on Wednesday, April 22nd, at 7PM in Ryan Gym.

New Girl:
An Honor Council Academic Trial
Released Spring 2015

This abstract was not released in accordance to the timeline specified by the Students’ Association Constitution. The confronting party consented to the release of the abstract. The confronted party consented to the release of the abstract. (The addition of this disclaimer began in Spring 2010).

Key:
Cece: Confronted party, a Bryn Mawr student
Professor Jessica Day: Confronting party
Second Year Modeling: Class

Summary/Pre-Trial:
Approximately one year before this trial took place, Honor Council was contacted by Professor [Jessica Day] with three potential violations (all from different students) of the Honor Code in her [Second Year Modeling] class. Two of these potential violations proceeded to trial right away, but [Cece], a Bryn Mawr student, went on college leave for reasons unrelated to the trial for the remainder of that semester and the following semester. Thus, the trial did not begin until Cece returned to the Bi-Co about one year after the initial confrontation. The case involved a presentation project, and when Cece turned in the second draft of her project, Professor Day noticed sections of her [modeling] that were far above her current level, which ended up being copied from an online source. The trial resolutions focused mostly on education and restoration, hoping to foster Cece’s successful return to the community.

Fact Finding:
Professor Day explained that the assignment in question had been a speech project in which students turned in two graded drafts before finalizing the presentation. She said that Cece’s first draft had been too short, and so she asked her to make it longer. Professor Day saw that the second draft had additions, but the [modeling] in some sections was above Cece’s proficiency, and so she was immediately suspicious it was not Cece’s work. Checking the internet, she found that a section of the added content was copied directly from an online source. In the next class,
Professor Day confronted Cece.

Cece then recounted the events from a year prior. She said that when she was preparing her second draft for the presentation, she had discussed the project with a friend who was an older student. Wanting to convey the ideas from the conversation with her friend, she had searched the internet for quotes from the [fashion show] that was the topic of her presentation. She added these in quotation marks, and attempted to cite them as being from her friend, although they were actually from the website. Cece said that she was in a rush to complete the draft, and so she included the quotations.

The floor was then open to the jury for questions. A juror asked why Cece had cited lines of her draft as from her friend when they were from an online source. Cece said that she had a relevant conversation with the older student and wanted to mix this with the information that she later found on the website. A juror asked if this was cited properly in her final draft, which Cece said it was. When asked how familiar she was with Bryn Mawr’s and Haverford’s plagiarism policies, Cece said that she was familiar with them due to a year-long writing course and a course for international students in stress-management. Another juror asked how much each draft was worth in the final grade, and Professor Day said each draft was worth 1% of the semester grade, and the final presentation was worth 3%. A juror asked how much of the draft was plagiarized. Professor Day responded that it was a small portion, but it was evident that the work was far above Cece’s proficiency level.

**Jury Deliberations/Statement of Violation:**

The jury as a whole felt that Cece was clearly under pressure when she improperly cited material, and that the plagiarized portion was quite small. Members of the jury felt it would be incorrect to say she didn’t violate the Code, but were concerned that it was a relatively small amount of plagiarism and that this trial was occurring a year after the fact. Still, some were concerned that Cece deliberately cited material from a blog as her friend. With this in mind, the jury consented on the following statement of violation:

*[Cece] violated the Honor Code by not attributing a portion of her draft to its original author. (10 jurors consent; Bi-Co liaison approves)*

**Circumstantial Portion:**

Cece began circumstantial portion by talking about what had been going on in her life at the time of the violation. She said that during the semester she took this course, she had been struggling with stress and was under pressure. She had taken more classes than usual, and often talked to Professor Day about stress and how to deal with it. In addition to this, she was seeing the school counselor and often spoke with her dean. All in all, this culminated in her taking leave from the
college in the middle of the semester, shortly following the confrontation with Professor Day. Cece said that during her time off she had done an internship in her hometown, received psychological support, and spent some time with friends and traveling. She said that she had just now gotten back to campus and hoped to build up a support system here.

A juror asked if Cece was now close to Professor Day, to which she said that she was, and that she would definitely be comfortable taking a class with her again. The chair then asked if Cece had any suggested resolutions for the trial. Cece said that she would like to become more familiar with the Honor Code and make better use of resources on campus that could help her with time management and other stresses.

Jury Deliberations and Tentative Resolutions:
Deliberations on tentative resolutions opened with the trial chair reading an email from Professor Day with suggested resolutions. She said that Cece should take a tutorial on the Honor Code and that she, Professor Day, should indicate her expectations under the Honor Code on her course syllabi. The jury moved to discussing potential resolutions. Someone mentioned that a grade change was off the table as Cece had dropped the class. Jurors expressed concern at Professor Day confronting all three students at once, but decided that the other two trials had already addressed this concern.

Noting that the trust between the student and professor seemed to be repaired, and that Cece’s time off seemed to have been restorative for her, jurors wanted to focus the resolutions on helping Cece form a support system on campus and educating her about the Honor Code. One juror mentioned that the trial itself was a form of accountability and felt that not much more was needed in this case. The jury wanted to include resolutions encouraging Cece to attend abstract discussions, requiring her to take the academic integrity tutorial, and having her write a letter to the community. The jury also discussed having Bi-Co Honor Code discussions during Customs Week as another way to bridge the gap between the Bryn Mawr and Haverford Honor Codes. The jury agreed that this trial should not be considered a disciplinary proceeding or reported on applications to institutions of higher learning, and that the violation certainly did not merit further separation from Haverford or from Bryn Mawr.

The jury consented to the following tentative resolutions:

1. [Cece] will take the Haverford Academic Integrity Tutorial by the end of the [semester omitted] semester. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside due to absence, Bi-Co liaison approves)
2. [Cece] will write a letter to the community, to be released with the abstract. This letter should be written by the beginning of the [semester omitted] semester. (9 jurors consent,
1. The jury recommends that [Cece] attend an Honor Council abstract discussion during the [semester omitted] semester. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside due to absence, Bi-Co liaison approves)

2. The jury supports Professor [Day] in being clear about her expectations about the Honor Code in her course syllabi. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside due to absence, Bi-Co liaison approves)

3. The jury recommends that Honor Council, Bryn Mawr’s Honor Board, and the Customs committees at Bryn Mawr and Haverford work on allotting time during Customs week for a Bi-Co discussion on the Honor Code. (8 jurors consent, 2 stand outside (1 due to absence), Bi-Co liaison approves)

4. The jury recommends that this case not be considered a disciplinary proceeding for the purposes of reporting to institutions of higher learning. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside due to absence, Bi-Co liaison approves)

Resolutions as a whole: (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside due to absence, Bi-Co liaison approves)

Finalizing Resolutions:
Both Cece and Professor Day expressed they agreed with all six resolutions. Thus, the resolutions went unchanged, and the jury consented to the following final resolutions:

1. [Cece] will take the Haverford Academic Integrity Tutorial by the end of the [semester omitted] semester. (10 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)

2. [Cece] will write a letter to the community, to be released with the abstract. This letter should be written by the beginning of the [semester omitted] semester. (10 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)

3. The jury recommends that [Cece] attend an Honor Council abstract discussion during the [semester omitted] semester. (10 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)

4. The jury supports Professor [Day] in being clear about her expectations about the Honor Code in her course syllabi. (10 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)

5. The jury recommends that Honor Council, Bryn Mawr’s Honor Board, and the Customs committees at Bryn Mawr and Haverford work on allotting time during Customs week for a Bi-Co discussion on the Honor Code. (9 jurors consent, 1 stands outside, Bi-Co liaison approves)

6. The jury recommends that this case not be considered a disciplinary proceeding for the purposes of reporting to institutions of higher learning. (10 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)

Resolutions as a whole: (10 jurors consent, Bi-Co liaison approves)
Post-Trial:
The resolutions were not appealed. Cece’s letter to the community is forthcoming; this abstract will be re-released upon Honor Council’s receipt of the letter.

Discussion Questions:
1. What is the best way, if any, for a jury to address accountability when the student drops the course before the trial occurs?
2. What are some reliable ways to decide whether or not a student-teacher relationship has been restored?
3. Should academic dishonesty in drafts be treated differently from academic dishonesty in final papers? If so, how?