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Key:
Serena: Confronted Party
Professor Luna: Confronting Party
Arcade Games 110: Class

Summary/Pre-Trial:
This trial concerns accidental plagiarism on an assignment in a second year [Arcade Games] class. The violation was unusual because the assignment was not what is typically discussed when considering plagiarism. Furthermore, the two other students in that section of the class had violated the code on the same assignment, and the professor had confronted them as a group for what ended up being separate violations. The jury focused heavily on the intent and extent of the violation, and whether or not the professor was partially to blame for not making expectations clear. The trial resulted in a zero on the project, several resolutions aimed at personal and community education, and several suggestions for improvements to community resources and programs.

Fact Finding Part 1:
One juror was not present. Due to technical and scheduling difficulties, Professor [Luna] could not be reached for this meeting. The confronted party, [Serena], began by giving her statement. The project in question was a presentation, for which the students were expected to hand in multiple drafts ahead of time. Serena struggled to express some of her points clearly, and looked online for inspiration. She incorporated several phrases without proper citation, and did not realize this constituted a breach of the Honor Code. The initial confrontation occurred after she handed in this first draft. She estimated that about one quarter of the draft was not her own
work at this point. Upon revision, Serena revised only the portions of the paper that Professor Luna had pointed out as being plagiarized, leaving two sentences that were not her own words. (Professor Luna did not highlight every instance of plagiarism in the first draft.) She attributed this oversight to the stress of having been confronted.

After being confronted a second time for the two remaining phrases, she rewrote the assignment entirely for the final draft. She could not recall plagiarism or the Code ever being discussed in the class, and felt that expectations for the use of outside sources were not made clear. This was the first assignment they had had where she felt research had been needed. During the time between the confrontation and the trial, Serena had begun to visit CAPS.

At this point, the jury had no more questions and Professor Luna could not be reached. The jury decided to reconvene to finish fact finding when the professor was next available.

**Fact Finding Part 2:**

The confronted party, all jurors, and a support person for the confronted party were present for this meeting. The confronting party skyped in.

Professor Luna had asked the students to write a draft for a presentation, but noticed that some sentences in Serena’s draft seemed copied. After finding matching sources online, Professor Luna gave Serena a warning and asked her to rewrite the paper before the next draft. She then noticed that some parts of the second draft were still copied directly from the sources and confronted Serena again. Serena admitted to only changing the parts of the paper that Professor Luna had pointed out. Professor Luna discussed with her colleagues what ought to be done, and decided to contact Honor Council.

The jury then presented their questions. The assignment had not required research or outside resources to be used. Professor Luna had handed the assignment back to Serena with the relevant sections highlighted, but did not go over it in person with her. The students were given one week for the second draft, but Serena rewrote her assignment immediately, and turned it in early. Professor Luna said that she would not have brought the case to Honor Council if all the issues had been fixed between the first and second drafts, but Serena failed to make all of the appropriate corrections. The plagiarised sections were complete sentences and were not paraphrased. The professor shared the relevant documents with the jury.

Professor Luna had taught Arcade Games 110 for several years without issue. Serena’s class, however, had multiple Honor Code violations, though Professor Luna did not feel that this assignment was outside the students’ abilities. Professor Luna said that she still trusts her students, and communication between her and her students had not been affected. She hoped that the trials would help the students understand and respect the Honor Code. Professor Luna had decided to have an explicit review of the Honor Code in her class, in light of the multiple violations.

Serena admitted to deliberately selecting a difficult topic outside of her capabilities when starting the assignment. She felt pressure from herself, not the professor, to perform well on the
assignment. She chose a topic she was passionate about, despite its difficulty. She had handed in the assignment early before leaving for the weekend, and her tutor for the class was sick so she could not consult with him. Serena claimed not to be aware that her actions constituted plagiarism. She did not remember what part of her draft was original or taken from the sources and relied solely on Professor Luna’s highlights to determine which parts to fix. She estimated that about 66% of the first draft was her own words.

Serena felt that the plagiarism was due to overtaxing her ability in the class and being too ambitious. All her plagiarism education at Haverford had focussed on essays, and she did not realize that these rules also applied to this assignment, as the situation was different. She now sees plagiarism as taking others’ words in any case or situation without citing; upon prompting by the jury, she extended this definition to include ideas as well as words.

Serena and her support person left, and Professor Luna signed off Skype. The jury then began to deliberate on a statement of violation.

Jury Deliberations/Statement of Violation:

Most of the jurors initially felt that a violation had occurred. The jury was unsure of the severity of the violation; some jurors felt that they could not yet be sure of the extent of the plagiarism and were undecided on which drafts should be considered. One juror was uncertain that the small amount of plagiarism represented in the second draft fully constituted a violation of the Honor Code. The jury felt that Serena’s admission of plagiarism indicated that she was in need of restoration. The jury also discussed how the opinion of the confronting party should be weighed.

There was some discussion on whether or not Serena’s failure to ask for clarification on the proper use of outside sources for the assignment counted as a further violation of the Honor Code. However, since she did not think it would be a problem, it seemed unreasonable to expect her to think to ask for clarification. There was then a discussion of intention, however the jury decided to postpone that discussion until after the circumstantial portion of the trial. The jury decided to consider the drafts together, and consented to the following statement of violation:

[Serena] violated the Honor Code on the first draft of her assignment by incorporating another's writing and representing it as her own. This violation continued when she failed to remove all plagiarized parts when revising for her second draft. (10 jurors consented.)

Circumstantial Portion:

The confronted party and all jurors were present for this meeting. The confronting party opted not to attend.

Serena began by explaining the circumstances that she felt influenced the violation. She referenced cultural differences as an international student and her uncertainty of the expectations of this assignment. She also mentioned that her knowledge of plagiarism was not very
developed. She had also studied [Pinball] and [The Claw], which are similar subjects but employ different learning styles, which did not translate well to Arcade Games. She explained that she had been very stressed by the initial confrontation, to the point that she felt physically ill. After the initial confrontation, she was only able to spend two days on the second draft. She did not consider rewriting the entire paper, and did not believe at the time that anything in the paper was still plagiarized, although she acknowledged that she should have checked it more thoroughly. She also had another large project due around the same time.

The initial confrontation occurred at the end of a class, as another group of students was entering the classroom. This made the confrontation feel rushed. She did not have an opportunity to discuss it further with the professor, as Professor Luna was not in her office when she went to see her. She was also unable to work with her tutor as he was out sick. The jury then looked over the drafts Serena had brought in as well as the sources Professor Luna had found that matched her work. Serena stated that she had mostly been concerned that she would misuse concepts that were new and unfamiliar.

The jury then asked Serena how she felt about the trial and what resolutions she would like to see come out of it. At the time of the trial, she had begun to visit CAPS to receive help with stress management. She was relieved by how the trial had progressed as compared to the conversations she had had with Professor Luna and was unsure whether she would want to take classes with Professor Luna in the future. She said that she would like to take a tutorial on the Honor Code, write up something outlining key Honor Code points for students taking this class in the future, and receive a zero on the two drafts, but not the rest of the assignment, since she had rewritten the paper entirely for the final draft.

**Jury Deliberations on Tentative Resolutions Part One:**

The jury began by discussing the resolutions that Serena had suggested. They discussed whether any guide she might write should go solely to the students taking the class, or be distributed more generally as part of Honor Council’s forthcoming online Honor Code guide. There was then a discussion on the extent of the violation and whether the phrases could have been worded differently. There was significant discussion on whether or not the plagiarism was intentional, and whether there was a difference between unintentional plagiarism and negligent plagiarism. One juror was still not convinced that a violation had occurred, despite having consented to the Statement of Violation, and was concerned about unduly adding to Serena’s stress. The jury eventually decided to move on under the assumption that, independent of intentionality, a violation had occurred, and they needed to come up with resolutions to resolve the breach of community trust.

There was a discussion of whether or not the professor could have done more to prevent

---

1 This refers to a guide that Honor Council is working on compiling and publishing to the website. When completed, the guide will provide insight on plagiarism avoidance in a multitude of situations, as well as proper confrontation and other issues relevant to the Honor Code, predominantly written by trial parties.
this, especially since all three students in the class ended up being confronted about this assignment. The jury felt that the fact that the professor did not give more instructions was part of the problem. They also wanted Serena’s and Professor Luna’s relationship to be repaired, and considered a mediation, so that Serena could show Professor Luna that she had contemplated and understood the words she used, even if they were not her own.

Another consideration was that most plagiarism education focuses on formal papers, which is not what this was. There was then some discussion as to whether they should ask her to rewrite her assignment, but there were several logistical problems, as well as the fact that it had already been essentially fulfilled as she had rewritten it entirely for the final draft.

At this point, the jury decided to break and continue with deliberations at the next meeting.

**Jury Deliberations on Tentative Resolutions Part Two:**

This meeting began with the chair requesting that they not focus on whether or not the plagiarism was intentional, which they seemed divided on, and instead work on resolutions. Other jurors felt that it was impossible to come up with resolutions before solving the issue of intentionality.

The jury then discussed possible grade changes. They wanted to hold Serena accountable², without being punitive. There was lengthy discussion on whether the grade of the full assignment or just the plagiarized drafts should be changed, as well as the relative benefits and costs to the community and individual represented by a grade change. Some jurors felt that the entirely rewritten second draft signified a restorative gesture, and didn’t not want to take points off from it. Others felt it would be unfair to the other students in the class if Serena received the same grade on the final draft as she would have had she completed the entire project honestly. The jury decided to move forward with a grade change on the entire assignment. The jury felt that accountability was adequately addressed through the grade change and trial process.

The jury then discussed education. One juror felt that the violation had not been Serena’s fault, since she had not been properly educated about plagiarism. This sparked a discussion on whether it is the responsibility of the student or the community to make sure they understand the expectations associated with the Honor Code. The jury also felt that plagiarism education was lacking in some way, and wanted to direct a resolution to the writing program, although they realized the difficulty of directing resolutions at bodies that are not required to follow the Honor Code or abide by trial resolutions.

Other resolutions included CAPS, which Serena was already using, but that the jury felt was not readily available since it took Serena a week to get an appointment. When separation was brought up, some jurors felt it was inappropriate that they even had to discuss separation in

---

² The goals of an Honor Council Trial are education, restoration, and accountability
cases such as this, and wondered if they could write a resolution to that effect. Another juror pointed out that such changes are more suited to a Plenary resolution than a trial resolution. The jury also discussed the way in which Professor Luna confronted her students in a group, but did not feel it was appropriate for a resolution.

The jury consented to the following resolutions:

1. Although the jury recognizes the work [Serena] put into the third draft and the effort to promote accountability, education, and restoration this represents; the jury recommends she receive a zero on the entire [assignment]. (8 jurors consented, 2 stood outside)

2. [Serena] will read Maud McInerney’s essay “Plagiarism and How to Avoid it” and will use it as a resource for the guide (see next resolution). (10 jurors consented)

3. [Serena] will write a guide for future students of this class about what constitutes plagiarism and how to avoid it, as per her suggestion. This guide will also be available to all students taking [gaming] classes. (10 jurors consented)

4. The jury recommends that Professor [Luna] incorporates [Serena]’s guide into her course as per [Serena]’s suggestion. (10 jurors consented)

5. [Serena] will write a letter to the community reflecting on how her experience as an international student influenced the circumstances leading up to the violation and her trial experience. This letter will be distributed to next year’s members of the International Student Organization [sic] (ISO) and included in the abstract. (10 jurors consented)

6. The jury recommends that [Serena] and [Professor Luna] participate in a mediated dialogue with the goal of coming to a common understanding. (10 jurors consented)

7. The jury supports [Serena]’s use of CAPS. (10 jurors consented)

8. The jury is concerned about the unavailability of CAPS appointments due to a lack of resources. (10 jurors consented)

9. The jury strongly recommends that the writing program institutes consistent, standardized plagiarism education. (10 jurors consented)

10. Honor Council will write a guide to confrontation [Appendix A] applicable to students, faculty, and staff. This guide will be made available on the Honor Council website. (10 jurors consented)

11. The jury recommends that this incident not be reported to institutions of higher learning. (10 jurors consented)

Resolutions as a whole: 10 jurors consented

---

3 Separation was brought up because the Honor Code states, “An act of plagiarism constitutes a student’s withdrawal from the commitment to the academic honesty required by the Honor Code, and will normally result in separation from the community…”

4 By “International Student Organization,” the jury intended to direct this resolution to the organizers of the International Student Orientation.
Finalizing Resolutions:

At the beginning of the meeting, Serena stated that she liked all of the tentative resolutions, and was wondering about the timeline and logistics of some of her resolutions. The chair answered her questions, including an explanation of the purpose of the mediation between Serena and Professor Luna. Serena left.

The jury discussed whether or not it was appropriate to make recommendations or suggestions to bodies not under Council's jurisdiction. They discussed what precedent this would set. They also changed the letter distribution resolution (#5) from a mandate to a suggestion. The jury consented to the following finalized resolutions.

1. *Although the jury recognizes the work [Serena] put into the third draft and the effort to promote accountability, education, and restoration this represents; the jury recommends she receive a zero on the entire [assignment].* (8 jurors consented, 2 stood outside)
2. *[Serena] will read Maud McInerney’s essay “Plagiarism and How to Avoid it” and will use it as a resource for the guide (see next resolution).* (all jurors consented)
3. *[Serena] will write a guide for future students of this class about what constitutes plagiarism and how to avoid it, as per her suggestion. This guide will also be available to all students taking [gaming] classes.* (all jurors consented)
4. *The jury recommends that professor [Luna] incorporates [Serena’s] guide into her course as per [Serena]’s suggestion.* (all jurors consented)
5. *[Serena] will write a letter to the community reflecting on how her experience as an international student influenced the circumstances leading up to the violation and her trial experience. The jury recommends that this letter be distributed to next years members of the International Student Organization [sic] (ISO) and will be included in the abstract.* (all jurors consented)
6. *The jury recommends that [Serena] and Professor [Luna] participate in a mediated dialogue with the goal of coming to a common understanding.* (all jurors consented)
7. *The jury supports [Serena]’s use of CAPS.* (all jurors consented)
8. *The jury is concerned about the unavailability of CAPS appointments due to a lack of resources.* (all jurors consented)
9. *The jury strongly recommends that the writing program institutes consistent, standardized plagiarism education; if such changes are already being instituted the jury supports these efforts.* (all jurors consented)
10. *Honor Council will write a guide to confrontation applicable to students, faculty, and staff. This guide will be made available on the Honor Council website.* (all jurors consented)
11. *The jury recommends that this incident not be reported to institutions of higher learning.* (all jurors consented)

Resolutions as a whole: all jurors consented
Post-Trial:
The resolutions were not appealed.

Serena's Letter:
Dear Haverford Community,

I would like to apologize for my acts that violated the academic honor code. Honor code has been part of the reason that I chose to be in this community and I had a hard time to forgive myself for what I did. Throughout the trial process, I was able to better reflect on what had happened and how I can prevent anything like this to happen in the future.

I felt that I was less conscious of what constitute of plagiarism in a situation that it is not a paper but a draft for an assignment. As in a paper, the set of specific rules concerning format and quotation embedded in the style makes me constantly aware of the ways in which I participate in academic discussion and using the paper as a means to build my ideas upon previous discussions. However, in the case that it is not an academic paper but an assignment of [gaming techniques], I became subconsciously influenced by how I was asked to [play] and being able to write in the style of other’s when I learnt my own [gaming technique] and therefore it became ambiguous to me the difference between common knowledge and using other person’s words. I now think that it is really important to know that the academic rules that are made more explicit in a paper are the same as that of other academic work formats. When my professor first confronted me, I was not able to process through everything. I think that the fact of being an international student and the extra stress that comes from being in an environment not yet too familiar, I did not have any experience of dealing with stress in a case like this. If I had reached out for help sooner and first became able to process what happened and why it happened before moving onto correcting my draft, the result may be very different. I am now working on dealing with stress and how to work through the mistake that I made rather than suppressing everything in my mind just because that I did it wrong.

I am grateful for the help of Honor Council that enables me to reflect upon the whole process the reasons that caused it, and what should I do to prevent it from happening again. I also feel that I re-learned a lot of things that was ambiguous to me before and that I have now a better understanding of the meaning of Honor Code.
Appendix A:

Confrontation guide

1. Don’t be afraid of confrontation - it is an essential component of maintaining our community. We all confront each other in informal ways every day, so there should be no stigma against being forthright with one another about any concerns.
2. Be civil, respectful, and thoughtful as a confronting or confronted party. Any hostility (perceived or real) will prevent a mutual understanding from being achieved.
3. Don’t confront someone while under the influence (them or you). Both parties should be physically and emotionally present for a dialogue to be successful.
4. Confrontations are confidential - make sure you are in a safe, private space where others will not overhear you and where you can engage in a dialogue without posing a risk for either party’s confidentiality.
5. Initiate a confrontation dialogue in person, if possible. A willingness to be open and talk face-to-face will help achieve a more successful dialogue and resolution.
6. If there has been an incident to prompt confrontation, give everyone some time to cool down before initiating a dialogue.
7. Often confrontation involves strong emotions - try your best to really listen to the other party and understand their point of view. This is the essence of a confrontation dialogue – not just to share your concerns, but to understand the other party’s perspective as well.
8. Try speaking in “I statements” to express your concerns, in order to avoid assigning blame or sounding accusatory. A confronting or confronted party may become closed off to dialogue if they feel like they are being attacked.
9. Be clear what the issue is when you are confronting someone. After the confrontation has finished, there should be no ambiguity about what the problem is and how to move forward.
10. Remember that coming to a mutual understanding does not mean that the problem is solved or that the two parties agree with one another. It simply means that both parties have had an opportunity to voice their concerns and were listened to by the other party.
11. If you are concerned that a confrontation dialogue will not be successful or that a mutual understanding will not be achieved between the two parties alone, you may bring in a third party to mediate the conversation. This should ideally be someone who knows both parties and won’t be biased towards one of them. An example might be having a CP mediate a confrontation between two freshman roommates.

---

This set of tips for confrontation was written by members of Honor Council to fulfill resolution #10, but also treats confrontation more broadly including both academic and social confrontation. This guide has also been posted on Honor Council's website at [http://honorcouncil.haverford.edu/resources/tips-on-confrontation/](http://honorcouncil.haverford.edu/resources/tips-on-confrontation/) so that it may serve as a resource for posterity.
12. If a confrontation over a potential violation of the social Honor Code cannot be resolved in an initial dialogue, the case may be brought to Honor Council by contacting code@haverford.edu. For potential academic violations, all cases should be brought to Honor Council regardless of the success of the confrontation, as there may be a potential breach of trust with the greater community that needs to be resolved. Remember that bringing a case to Council does not mean it will necessarily go to trial or that anyone will get in trouble. If a case is sent to Council, we will read statements from all parties and determine if a) a violation of the Honor Code may have occurred; b) if a trial, mediation, or other form of hearing would be productive in addressing the concerns raised in the statements.

Discussion Questions:
1. How should professors approach confronting multiple students in the same class about different potential violations? Is it ever appropriate to confront multiple students at once?
2. How should juries direct resolutions to people who are not bound to follow resolutions?
3. To what degree is a grade change punitive? Is it possible to fully separate the idea of accountability from the idea of punishment?