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Introduction:
During the first semester of her senior year, Hera, a Bryn Mawr student, was enrolled in two Haverford classes, Study of Ancient Cities with Professor Poseidon and Mythology with Professor Apollo. Hera was accused of plagiarism for one paper in each class. Professor Poseidon claimed that Hera based the structure of her paper off of Wikipedia and plagiarized a few passages from a website. In Hera’s Mythology final paper, Professor Apollo found passages that were identical to parts of a paper one could purchase online.

Pre-Trial:
Honor Council discussed whether or not it was best to separate the incidents into two trials. Council decided to hold one trial with two separate fact finding sessions and one joint circumstantial portion. This arrangement would help avoid heavy time commitments for all involved (including Hera), while still allowing the jury to consider both plagiarism violations separately. To try to avoid biases, the non-Council members on the jury would only be told of the incident from Professor Poseidon’s class after the fact-finding portion for the potential violation from Professor Apollo’s class.

Fact Finding 1:
Professor Poseidon’s statement:
Professor Poseidon was not present at the trial, so the Chair read his statement aloud to Hera and the jury. Professor Poseidon wrote that Hera had lifted at least two paragraphs in her final research paper from a blog-type website. He also wrote that Hera had structured her paper off of Wikipedia. She had failed to cite both websites. The jury did not have a copy of Hera’s paper for Professor Poseidon’s class.

Hera’s Statement:
Hera began by saying that Professor Poseidon had exaggerated the extent of the plagiarism in the paper. She said there had been at most three sentences. Hera admitted to visiting the Wikipedia website, but denied structuring her paper from the site. She acknowledged that she should have included it in her bibliography. Hera explained how Professor Poseidon confronted her. After winter break, Professor Poseidon called her into his office, asked her if she had done anything wrong, and gave her the opportunity to go through her paper and correct any citations. Hera very carefully went through her paper and added Wikipedia to her source list, along with adding some more citations. Hera went back to meet with Professor Poseidon. He showed her the blog-type website where he found sentences identical to a few in her paper.
Hera was shocked, saying she didn’t even recognize the website. However, when searching her internet history later, she realized that she had accessed that site when making her outline about a week before actually writing her paper. She said that the outline was a combination of different sources along with ideas of her own. She assumed she got distracted while making her outline and forgot to cite the website in her outline. When writing the paper a week later, she never cited the website because she thought the sentences were her own.

_Jury deliberations:_

Once Hera left, the jury discussed whether or not a violation of the Honor Code had taken place. The jury wondered whether it was necessary to have a copy of the paper before coming to a statement of violation, but decided the paper wasn’t necessary because both Professor Poseidon and Hera agreed that a violation had occurred. The jury then discussed whether or not intentionality mattered when coming to a statement of violation. After reviewing a section of the Honor Code (Article 3, Section 2) it was decided that intent is taken into account when making resolutions, not statements of violation. It was decided that a violation had occurred and the jury unanimously consented to the statement below:

_Hera violated the Honor Code by representing another person’s ideas as her own in neglecting to cite every source used in her paper._

**Fact Finding 2:**

_Hera’s statement:_
Hera readily admitted to purchasing a paper online and turning it in as her own Mythology final paper. She added, “I take full responsibility for turning in a paper I did not write and putting my name on it”.

_Professor Apollo’s statement:_
Professor Apollo described the assignment. The 10 to 12 page final paper had been on the syllabus since the first day of class, but the paper topic was not given out until two weeks before the paper was due. Students had the opportunity to hand in a paper proposal for feedback, and Hera did not take advantage of this opportunity. While Professor Apollo was reading Hera’s paper, he noticed that it was very inconsistent and did not really make sense. Professor Apollo also said that many of the concepts and phrases in the paper had never been discussed in class. Professor Apollo googled some of the phrases and immediately found the online essays.

_Jury questions:_
Professor Apollo clarified that students were not allowed to use outside sources in their papers and that it was written on the assignment sheet so there would be no uncertainty. Hera responded, saying that she knew using outside sources was wrong and that there had been no uncertainty on her part. A juror asked Hera about the timeframe during which everything occurred. Hera said that Professor Apollo’s paper was the last thing on an exam schedule she had planned out for herself. She said that at three or four in the morning the day before the paper was due, she just panicked. Instead of emailing
Professor Apollo or her dean, she searched for and purchased an essay online. A juror asked if she had written any of the paper herself. Hera said that she might have changed a few words. Professor Apollo said that he had found three sources for Hera’s purchased essay. Hera said that she had only purchased and used one essay.

The jury asked Professor Apollo some questions while Hera was out of the room. The jury wanted to clarify whether or not Hera initially admitted to purchasing the paper when Professor Apollo first confronted her. Professor Apollo recollected how after reading the paper, he had decided not to assign a grade to it before speaking with Hera. He emailed Hera to let her know that a grade would not be appearing on her transcript until they had spoken. Right away Hera called Professor Apollo to ask him what was wrong. Professor Apollo responded saying that Hera knew what she did. Hera said that she might have forgotten to cite in a few places. Professor Apollo reminded Hera that it was not a research paper and that sources were not supposed to be used. At this point Hera admitted to buying the paper and told Professor Apollo that she would do whatever was necessary to fix the situation.

Hera was called back into the room. She apologized to Professor Apollo for her disrespectful actions and said how she truly regretted her decision to plagiarize. Professor Apollo responded, saying he was saddened by the fact that a student would plagiarize in his class and that it now affects what he thinks when he is grading the papers of other students. Although he tries not to let this situation affect his other students, he is definitely more attentive when grading. However, he knows that over time his trust with his students will become fully restored.

Jury Deliberations:

Once Hera and Professor Apollo left, everyone on the jury agreed that a violation of the Honor Code had occurred. The jury consented on the following statement of violation with no members standing outside:

**Hera violated the Honor Code by submitting a purchased paper as her own.**

Circumstantial Portion:

Hera began by addressing her paper for Professor Poseidon. She told the jury that the mistake in the paper had been a careless error. She continued by saying that her major did not require writing long papers. She also mentioned that she was taking the class pass/fail, so she did not put in as much effort as she usually would.

Hera then talked about the paper for Professor Apollo’s Mythology class. Hera explained that it was the last item she planned to do during exam week and all her other work took longer than expected. The night before the paper was due she wrote around two pages before having a “complete mental block”. She tried taking a break from writing, but as she was running out of time, she didn’t know what to do. She panicked and bought the paper online.

The jury asked Hera whether or not she had problems in the past with previous finals weeks. Hera said that she had not; however, in the past most of her work had
consisted of exams instead of papers and that she was not as good at managing her time while writing papers. A juror asked Hera whether she had done the majority of the work for both classes throughout the semester. Hera replied that she had, saying she had read both books that her Mythology paper was on and that she had not had trouble in the past with these classes because the writing assignments had been shorter. Hera also added that it had been a very stressful semester because she had spent a lot of time applying for jobs. She did not need either of the classes to fulfill distribution requirements.

After questioning ended, Professor Apollo’s tentative resolutions were read aloud. Professor Apollo felt that Hera should fail the course, as she had not completed the class requirements since she had not actually written the final paper. In regards to education, Professor Apollo wanted to make sure Hera understood the broader implications of her plagiarism. In his email to the Chair of the trial, Professor Apollo asked, "Does Hera understand the larger issues involved here? Does she understand that the measure of success in a course is what a student learns from it, not the grade she gets? That one learns in a course not only the subject being covered, but also a mode of thinking and analysis as well as (and this is crucial) a way of dealing with challenges with integrity, in a thoughtful and ethical fashion? That long after one forgets the [details of the readings], its contexts, and plots, it is the important but intangible lessons that remain? Does she understand that by presenting someone else's ideas as her own, Hera was disregarding the basis of our dealing with one another as members of an intellectual community? Does she realize that even in the larger world outside college, so much of our daily dealings is made possible by the trust that what you see is what you get?"

Hera felt that failing Professor Apollo’s class was a fair resolution. She did not think that failing Professor Poseidon’s class would be a fair resolution since she did all of the work for the class, and the plagiarism in her paper was a careless mistake. Hera suggested that she would like to do something “proactive”, such as meeting with a peer tutor or dean to improve her time management or writing skills. The jury asked Hera how she would feel about separation. She said that she had considered this resolution but felt that it would cause a huge problem for her, with few weeks remaining until graduation. She felt that separation would be less restorative and more detrimental to her future. The jury asked how she felt about writing a letter to the community. Hera was very enthusiastic in wanting to apologize to her classmates and the community. To repair the breach of trust between the two professors and herself, Hera was willing to continue meeting with them if the jury felt that it would be restorative, even though she wasn’t sure how helpful it would really be.

Tentative Resolutions:
First the jury dealt with the citation issue in Professor Poseidon’s class. With a copy of the paper on hand, the jury decided that two sentences were obviously plagiarized from an internet source. In his statement, Professor Poseidon had said that Hera structured her entire paper off of Wikipedia, and the jury was unsure about how much significance to give this claim. The jury deliberated over whether or not to recommend a grade for the paper. Some members doubted the jury’s ability to recommend a non-arbitrary grade, but did not want Professor Poseidon to give Hera a 4.0
for the paper. It was decided that the jury would give some sort of guidance to Professor Poseidon in grading the paper.

The jury discussed Hera’s suggestion of going to the writing center as a resolution, and decided that it would not be appropriate because Hera wasn’t taking any writing intensive courses at the time. The breach of trust with Professor Poseidon was discussed, and the jury concluded that without the professor’s input, they could not determine the best way to repair a breach, if one existed.

The jury decided that an educational letter about her experiences and reflections on an online essay about plagiarism would sufficiently address the breach of trust with the community for this violation.

Due to the very long length of the meeting, the jury adjourned and met again to continue making tentative resolutions. At this assembly, the jury focused on the violation in Professor Apollo’s class. The chair explained the options for separation, noting that separation from Haverford could be social or academic. The jury also had the option to recommend to Bryn Mawr’s Honor Board that Hera be separated from Bryn Mawr as well. The jury discussed how separation could serve to restore the breach of trust between Hera and the community while also educating her. Some jurors questioned the purpose of separation from Bryn Mawr. The jury discussed how taking a class at Haverford is a privilege, and that by grossly breaching trust with the community, Hera no longer deserved this opportunity. However, the jury struggled with the line between punitive measures and resolutions that hold students accountable for their actions.

Before completely figuring out the more complicated possibility of separation, the jury unanimously acknowledged that Hera should receive a 0.0 in Professor Apollo’s Mythology class for not completing the course requirements by turning in a purchased paper worth a large percentage of the grade. The jury decided not to create a resolution that would require Hera to meet with a peer mentor or with her dean, as Hera was already taking initiative to do this.

The jury also decided that a second letter would help restore the breach of trust with the community by giving her a way to address the community. The jury considered the purpose of the letter, and decided that it would be best as a reflection and apology to address restoration and education. The question of where to release the letter was brought up. Some jurors wanted it released at Bryn Mawr, while others did not see the purpose, as this was not a case of a Bryn Mawr student not understanding the Haverford Honor Code. Some expressed the idea that any opportunity to educate the Bi-Co community should be embraced, and that Hera’s letter could teach and warn Bryn Mawr students. The jury discussed the possibility of Hera writing a separate letter to the Bryn Mawr community, and decided that the letter would not do any harm, but did not want it in a resolution.

The jury discussed the variety of options addressing separation from Haverford. Hera could be prohibited from enrolling in classes at Haverford, using academic resources (such as the library), or physically being on Haverford’s campus. After
discussing the division between the academic and social aspects of the Code, the jury decided that social separation would be inappropriate because the violation was not social. The jury unanimously agreed to academic separation from Haverford in which Hera was not allowed to enroll in classes at Haverford, but was still allowed to use its academic resources. This would preclude her from receiving credit for the Haverford course in which she was currently enrolled.

A juror brought up the possibility of separation from Bryn Mawr. One juror pointed out that if Hera had been a Haverford student, she most likely would have been separated from Haverford, and so she should not get “preferential treatment” simply for being a Bryn Mawr student. However, many jurors were concerned about achieving accountability without being punitive.

The jury struggled with the issue of Hera being a second semester senior. Because of the timing of the violation, separation from Bryn Mawr would have to occur in the middle of the semester. If she were at any other time during her college career, Hera would have been permitted to finish her already-started semester and begin separation during the next semester. One juror mentioned that if Hera were a junior, there would be much less of a dilemma. Another pointed out that taking individual concerns into account is a central part of the trial system because not all situations are the same. One resolution will not have the same effect in every case.

One juror questioned if it was within a Haverford jury’s place to recommend separation from Bryn Mawr, as it was unclear if a breach of trust had even occurred between Hera and the Bryn Mawr community. The jury decided it was within its bounds.

Discussion turned to Hera’s ability to graduate at the end of the semester. Hera was enrolled in one class at Haverford, so the 0.0 in Professor Apollo’s class and separation from Haverford meant Hera would be one credit short of graduating. She would not be able to receive her diploma in May, or march with her class. One member mentioned the possibility that Hera miscounted her credits, or that she could sign up for two quarter classes and receive enough credits to graduate. This juror believed that if the jury did not think Hera deserved to graduate, then it needed to be made clear in the resolutions, not let it happen based on meeting graduation requirements. Jurors discussed a resolution prohibiting Hera from walking with her class, whether or not she met graduation requirements. Some felt this would be punitive, while others thought it would give her a symbolic opportunity to reflect on her actions without requiring separation from Bryn Mawr. Some jurors were concerned that it would be a barrier to restoration, visually representing Hera’s withdrawal from the academic community.

The jury struggled greatly while trying to figure out if separation from Bryn Mawr was necessary for restoration, or if it was too punitive. Some jurors declared that the magnitude of the offense called indisputably for separation from the Bi-Co community, while others felt it was punitive and would only make Hera’s life more difficult. One juror questioned the purpose of separation from Bryn Mawr, especially
regarding education. Another juror disagreed and thought it would be educational for Hera, as well as hold her accountable for her actions and help repair the breach of trust.

The jury discussed Hera’s cooperation and attitude in the trial process. She seemed aware of her actions and eager to repair the breach of trust; she had also taken the initiative to write a letter to the jury. However, some jurors were skeptical and wondered if Hera was only trying to lessen the resolutions since she had not turned herself in. A juror said that Hera would act remorseful—even if she wasn’t—because it could lessen the severity of the resolutions. Another juror acknowledged that Hera would feel horrible if separated, but she did commit a horrible act of plagiarism, so it would be appropriate. One juror felt that Hera was focused solely on graduating, making her seem less sincerely remorseful, and another juror countered by declaring that Hera should not be punished for honestly expressing her wishes.

The jury seemed divided regarding separation, and tried to brainstorm other options, but did not find with which it was satisfied. Still divided, the jury continued exploring the possibility of separation from Bryn Mawr. One juror felt that Hera had put the jury in a difficult position by committing one of the most egregious acts of plagiarism at such a crucial time in her life but the jury still needs to hold her accountable. The Honor Code is meant to hold up community standards, and one juror worried that allowing Hera the possibility to graduate would not hold up the academic integrity of the Bi-co community. It was brought up that at most other schools, Hera would be expelled, and one juror replied, “That is why we are not most schools. We take individuals into account”. The jury discussed how the purpose of expulsion at other schools is to hold up community standards, and that by letting Hera graduate it would not be doing that.

The possibility of a “double standard” between Bryn Mawr and Haverford students arose. One juror pointed out that Haverford was not lowering its academic standards because of the separation from Haverford. It was suggested that the jury give Bryn Mawr’s Honor Board the opportunity to decide if their academic integrity was threatened by not separating Hera. Some jurors disagreed because this jury, not Honor Board, had received all the information, and should therefore make the decision; they considered not doing so an irresponsible act of passing off the jury’s obligations to Bryn Mawr’s Honor Board. One jury member talked about how a Haverford jury cannot make a judgment call about Bryn Mawr’s academic standards because there was not breach of trust between Hera and Bryn Mawr. Another juror countered, describing how the two colleges are very closely knit, and almost as one school academically.

The jury deliberated on asking Honor Board to make the separation decision. The line between encouraging and strengthening the partnership of the Bi-co and diluting the jury’s own authority in the matter was thoroughly discussed. Some jurors felt this possibility was only acceptable because they wanted to avoid personal responsibility for separating Hera. However, the jury generally agreed that assigning authority to Honor Board was acceptable if it were in the spirit of increasing the Bi-co partnership.
With the exception of two jurors who stood outside of consensus, the jury came to the decision to separate Hera from Bryn Mawr for one semester. One did so because she believed that the jury did have the right to make the decision, just as she “would want Honor Board to make this same decision if this happened with a Haverford student at Bryn Mawr.” The second juror also agreed with separating Hera, but felt that the wording of the resolution weakened the jury’s authority.

The jury also created a resolution that would come into effect if Bryn Mawr’s Honor Board decided not to separate Hera. According to this resolution, Hera would rewrite the paper from Professor Apollo’s class and visit the writing center three times during the process.

Because of the community education benefits, the jury drafted a resolution asking Professor Apollo to write a letter to the community about her experience with this case.

The jury consented on the following tentative resolution with no members standing outside:

1. The final grade of the paper will be left to Professor Poseidon’s discretion and should reflect the plagiarism in the paper.
2. Hera will write a letter to the community reflecting on her experiences and Professor McInerney’s Essay “Plagiarism and How to Avoid It” in order to create awareness about proper citation.
3. The jury recommends that Hera receive a 0.0 in Professor Apollo’s class.
4. Hera will write a letter to the Haverford community reflecting on her actions and her understanding of the Honor Code
5. Hera is prohibited from taking any class at Haverford College this semester.
6. While the jury recognizes Bryn Mawr’s right to evaluate its community standards, we recommend that Hera be separated from Bryn Mawr College for one semester in light of her egregious violation of Bi-college academic standards.
7. Should Hera not be separated from Bryn Mawr College, she will rewrite Professor Apollo’s paper, for no credit, to Professor Apollo’s satisfaction. In writing this paper, Hera will visit the writing center at least three times.
8. The jury asks Professor Apollo to write a letter to the community regarding his experience and his views concerning the breach of trust.

Finalizing Resolutions:
Hera’s Reaction:
As she requested, Hera brought her dean as a character witness and a friend as a support person. Character witnesses are permitted to speak to the confronted party’s character, but not about the resolutions or the trial process. A support person is allowed to write notes to the confronted person and speak with the confronted during a break, but is

---

1 One of the jurors who had stood outside on resolution #6 asked that it be noted that she accepted the resolutions as a whole, even though she was still not comfortable with the resolution she had not consented to.
not permitted to speak during the trial. The chair asked Hera to respond to the resolutions. Hera pointed out that she had already completed weeks of work for her classes, which she would lose if separated. She would also lose part of her tuition payment. She acknowledged she had done something wrong, but said, “I took an eye from the community and I feel like the community took my head”. She felt that the jury’s resolutions were standard solutions to a nonstandard situation. As alternatives, she suggested meeting weekly with the professor of her current Haverford class, meeting with a peer mentor, and social separation from Haverford. She didn’t feel that separation from Bryn Mawr was “fair,” calling it “extreme punishment” and declaring that it would “ruin” her life because she wouldn’t be able to graduate. She also lost a minor by failing the Mythology class, and felt that this held her accountable. She felt that working on her time management skills would be more “proactive” and effective. Hera had no issues with the resolutions that did not involve separation. She also suggested community service, perhaps by talking to the freshmen class about plagiarism in general.

Hera’s dean confirmed that Hera would not be able to graduate at the end of the semester if she were separated from Haverford. Hera would not be permitted to walk at graduation and would have to take a summer class to receive her diploma. As a character witness, the dean said that he did not know Hera well, but that she had generally been a solid student with no other Bryn Mawr or Haverford Honor Code violations. He said that he had been very impressed with Hera’s reaction to the trial process.

When asked if she had considered turning herself in, Hera replied that she had not really considered it, but called Professor Apollo and admitted the plagiarism as soon as she received an email about her paper.

Jury Deliberations:
The jury noticed a discrepancy in Hera’s and Professor Apollo’s accounts of when Hera admitted to buying the paper. Hera had said she admitted immediately when questioned by her professor, while Professor Apollo had presented a different account. There was a general expression of mistrust and skepticism surrounding this discovery, but the jury decided to first finalize the less-controversial resolutions. The jury finalized resolutions one through four, and resolution eight, with slight wording changes. The jury also consented to separate Hera from Haverford, beginning immediately so she could not continue in her present Haverford class.

Deliberations about separation from Bryn Mawr began. The point was raised that Hera never really seemed to understand the breach of trust that occurred between her and the community. Some jurors did not feel that Hera seemed as concerned as she should be; she was trying hard to fix things, but seemed to lack an awareness of what accountability really means, as she deemed that even separation from just Haverford would be “too harsh”. Instead of focusing on the issues of academic integrity, morality, and community trust, she seemed to view turning in the purchased paper as a “slip-up” caused by bad time management skills. Jurors were concerned that Hera was focused solely on graduation, not on learning a significant lesson.
One juror suggested that separation from Bryn Mawr would remove her from the community in a way that would allow her to contemplate the gravity of her actions. Some felt that while separation would be difficult for Hera, the extent of the violation was disturbing enough that it would be the only way to hold her truly accountable. The jury wanted to put Hera in a situation that would require her to reflect and realize what was so precisely wrong with her actions. It was pointed out that despite having much time to do so, Hera did not turn herself into Honor Council.

Hera’s status as a senior seemed to both justify separation and endorse allowing her to remain at school. Jury members pointed out the extensive financial and occupational repercussions from separation from Bryn Mawr that would only occur for a second semester senior. Others pointed out that as a senior, Hera should have “known better”, and thus she should accept stronger repercussions than a freshman would. Some jurors felt that since Hera committed the most severe violation of plagiarism, during a stage when such actions are least forgivable, she should have to face comparable resolutions.

Discussion turned to the three guiding principles of resolutions: education, restoration, and accountability. Jurors were concerned that without separation from Bryn Mawr, Hera would not be held accountable, but that it was still punitive; one juror said that it should not be supported simply as a last resort. A few jurors felt that separation would not provide Hera with the understanding of how wrong her actions were. One juror questioned, “What sort of precedent does not separating Hera set?” Another juror suggested that not separating her would allow the deterioration of the academic standards of both colleges.

The jury tried again to brainstorm alternatives to separation from Bryn Mawr, but did not find any agreeable options. Only separation from Bryn Mawr seemed to really address the crucial issue of getting Hera to understand the effects of her actions on the community. One juror pointed out that while separation from Bryn Mawr may have serious consequences for Hera, it could reasonably be harsher. At another school, Hera would most likely be expelled, and in different circumstances at Haverford, it would not be irrational to separate Hera from both colleges for a full year.

The jury decided to reword the original resolution to better reflect the jury’s authority on the matter. The jury consented on the re-written resolution, with two members standing outside, feeling that their voices had been heard. One member who consented noted that he did not see separation as an ideal option, and wished that there had been an alternative with less baggage. One juror who stood outside did so because he felt that if given no alternative, the jury should lean on the side of doing too little than too much to hold Hera accountable. Another juror felt that separation from Bryn Mawr did not accurately represent accountability, restoration, and education, and she worried that the outcome of separation would not necessarily be positive.

Generally, the consenting jury members felt that Hera had significantly violated the Honor Code and the privilege of being a Bi-co community member; despite the
negative consequences, this was the most adequate resolution the jury could fathom and so it seemed appropriate. One juror specifically noted that she did not feel like she was “settling” on this resolution as a last resort, but that it addressed everything it needed to.

The jury then finalized tentative resolution seven, and consented to the resolutions as a whole, with no members standing outside.

**Final Resolutions:**

Regarding Study of Ancient Cities:

1. **The final grade of the paper will be left to Professor Poseidon’s discretion and should reflect the plagiarism in the paper.**
2. **Hera will write a letter to the community reflecting on her experiences and Professor McInerey’s Essay “Plagiarism and How to Avoid It” in order to create awareness about proper citation.**

Regarding Mythology:

3. **The jury recommends that Hera receive a 0.0 in Professor Apollo’s class**
4. **Hera is prohibited from taking, or receiving credit for, any course at Haverford College this semester.**
5. **The jury recommends that Hera be separated from Bryn Mawr for the rest of the semester**
6. **Should Hera not be separated from Bryn Mawr College, she will rewrite Professor Apollo’s paper, for no credit, to Professor Apollo’s satisfaction. In writing this paper, Hera will visit the writing center at least three times.**
7. **Hera will write a letter to the Haverford community reflecting on her actions and her understanding of the Honor Code**
8. **The jury asks Professor Apollo to write a letter to the community regarding his experience and his views concerning the breach of trust.**

**Post-Trial:**

Hera’s case was presented to Bryn Mawr’s Honor Board. While Honor Board agreed with the severity of the violation, they felt that separation was too burdensome on Hera because she was a second semester senior. However, they did not want to allow Hera to graduate with her class, and thus stipulated that she must drop one of her classes if not separated from Haverford.

**Discussion Questions:**

1. Should the current system for dealing with violations by Bryn Mawr students at Haverford change?
2. When is separation appropriate? What is its purpose?
3. How should Honor Council react when Bryn Mawr’s Honor Board’s decision conflicts with a Haverford jury’s decision?
4. Can a Bi-College relationship flourish without one college upholding the integrity of the partner schools’ Honor Code?
Dear Members of the Haverford Community,

I never thought I would be one of the people who gets in trouble for plagiarizing. Like most of you beginning in the fifth grade my teacher taught me to use note cards to organize my thoughts and my research. Well skip forward eleven years and I seemed to have forgotten the importance of keeping your research organized. While writing a final paper I copied and pasted someone else’s thoughts into my outline without adding citations. Then, once I was in the process of writing my paper I assumed those thoughts were my own; when in fact the words were not my own. I sure wish I had continued with the process of note cards.

While I was reading Maud McInerney's article, Plagiarism and How to Avoid It I must say I learned a lot. One of McInerney's first points (it's even in bold) is that by claiming someone else's work as your own "you are committing an act of intellectual theft". This really struck a chord with me. When I began to think of plagiarism as stealing the weight of my mistake really sunk in. Thinking about it now I realize that stealing someone’s ideas is almost worse than stealing their money. Money is tangible, replaceable, but a unique idea cannot be replicated. For that I am truly sorry.

McInerney also brings up the point of intention. Although, it was never my intention to deceive and it was simply a case of my head being somewhere else my sloppiness still effects my academic integrity, and to be blunt is still stealing.

After all is said and done what I’ve learned is to be more careful. Be meticulous with your citations because even a careless error can still be plagiarism.

-Hera

Dear Members of the Haverford Community,

Last semester I made some bad choices. Choices that were the easy way out. Choices that were wrong and hurtful to both myself, my professors, and the people in this community.

Over the past few weeks I have had a great deal of time to reflect on the importance of honor and trust in a close knit community such as ours. I never fully grasped the ripple effect that one persons actions could have and how my actions hurt the entire community. What I have learned is that Haverford works very hard to maintain a delicate balance of trust and openness, and when ever some one lies or cheats or steals it throws the entire balance out of whack. It is up to everyone to be an honest upright member in order to keep this college strong.

For my actions I am deeply sorry. I am sorry to my professor of course, but I am also sorry to the community as a whole. Haverford College is a pretty amazing place and for it to stay that way people have to make good choices and when they don’t they have to come forward and be honest. Honesty I have learned is the first step towards healing.

Once again I am sorry to this community and I hope with time the balance can be regained

-Hera
To the community,

The Honor Code fosters a habit of ethical behavior and social responsibility among the students at Haverford. However, as a professor at the college, what I have valued most about the code is that it plays a central role in keeping me focused on the academic goals of every course I teach. Freed from having to police my students, I can give all my attention to what is most important in the classroom: the fullest possible exploration of the issues at hand, the intellectual development of my students, the growth of their ability to think boldly and express themselves clearly, and the cultivation of their ongoing curiosity about literature and its role in the world. I have been grateful to the code for clearing the air of the static of suspicion and anxiety and allowing us to apply ourselves to the work at hand. At the end of this trial, I remain convinced that, whatever its moral and ethical implications may be, the Honor Code is integral to our wellbeing as a serious intellectual community.

The free and audacious give and take of intellectual inquiry gets disrupted if we don’t play with honesty. Over the years, I have read Honor Council’s transcripts carefully and have drawn upon them to conduct my courses in ways that pre-empt misunderstandings that could lead to violations. But my tendency in reading the transcripts was to skip over impatiently the requisite references to “breach of trust,” which seemed clichéd and poorly-understood. What I perceived in the aftermath of Hera’s violation was that trust was indeed breached seriously, and not just between Hera and me. This was my surprising realization: once a student had cheated in my class, it became difficult for a while to keep the experience out of my mind in my dealings with other students. In a significant way, one student’s breach of trust affects a professor’s encounters with every student. It is only by seeing the conscientious work that my students consistently produced that I was reassured that the overwhelmingly large majority of students live and work by the code. Thus it is that the larger breach of trust that ensued from Hera’s violation is being repaired. I hope readers of this letter will see that the effects of violations of the code, and of the daily unremembered acts of observing it, are never localized and restricted to the two parties involved, but spread out to shape our dealings with each other as members of a community.

Best,

| Professor Apollo |