Professor Lee found instances of plagiarism in Darrin's thesis. An inquiry was held, and the jury confirmed that plagiarism constitutes a breach of the Honor Code. The jury came to a three-part resolution, which was amended by the administration of the college.

Professor Lee confronted Darrin because of plagiarism in Darrin's thesis, and, accordingly, Darrin spoke to the chairperson of Honor Council. Honor Council met and discussed the problem in abstract. Since all cases of suspected academic dishonesty go to trial, Council agreed on the need for a formal inquiry. Eight Council members and four randomly selected community members agreed to serve as jurors. The chairperson then notified Professor Lee and Darrin that a trial would occur. The chairperson clarified the trial process and invited Darrin to bring a support person. The inquiry began two days later.

FACT-FINDING

The meeting began with a moment of silence. Members of the jury and the confronted and confronting parties then introduced themselves. After reviewing the trial process, the chair asked the professor to speak. Professor Lee began by explaining the nature of Darrin's thesis: it consisted of considerable library research as well as independent work and ideas. When she read Darrin's next-to-last draft, she wondered whether it was not "too good," but did not want to distrust Darrin or doubt his capabilities. In the final copy of the thesis, however, the writing style in Darrin's introduction alarmed Professor Lee, and she checked several of his sources. She gave the jury a copy of Darrin's thesis, on which she indicated vast portions as plagiarized. She also provided photocopies of the original sources. Some passages copied verbatim lacked citation marks while others had no citation at all.

Darrin said that he could not remember ever having been taught proper footnoting procedures at Haverford. He said that he had always known plagiarism to be "taking someone else's work and claiming it as your own," but, until this problem had come up, he had thought that acknowledgement of the author "in any way, shape or form" was sufficient. He recognized his mistakes now that they had been pointed out to him, but he felt that Professor Lee had betrayed him by not realizing these problems earlier.

Professor Lee responded that Darrin had used perfect citation format in many parts of his thesis. Therefore, she naturally believed that he understood these methods of
citation. Also, Darrin had been in a previous course with Professor Lee in which she had explicitly gone over methods of footnoting. But Darrin felt that in a thesis-writing course the professor and student roles were those of "colleagues working together." He said he had trusted that he would be guided through the writing process and that he was not obligated to consult citation manuals on his own. A juror then asked Darrin "to what extent is an advisor responsible for a student's own academic integrity?" Darrin said that the responsibility for academic integrity begins with the student but ends with the advisor; more specifically, he said that he didn't realize he was "unclear" about footnoting policy or he "would have certainly asked."

In response to other jurors' questions, Darrin said that he had been writing his papers with this same attitude towards citation procedures throughout his four years at Haverford. He had known that a correct format exists for footnoting, but couldn't account for his ignorance of the specifics of that format. The jury and Darrin discussed the difference between paraphrasing and quoting directly and reviewed the proper notation of each. Darrin repeated that, although he now recognized the shortcomings in his thesis, while he was writing it he believed that he was working conscientiously and responsibly.

After the discussion drew to a close, Professor Lee, Darrin, and his support person left the room.

JURY DISCUSSION

Confronted with the numerous instances of blatant plagiarism in Darrin's thesis, the jury quickly agreed that a violation had occurred. Many of the jurors found it difficult to believe that, as a senior, Darrin could still be unaware of proper citation methods. Someone pointed out however, that in a community of trust, professors tend not to discredit students by checking behind them, and so it is certainly possible for instances of plagiarism to escape notice.

Two jurors volunteered to tell Professor Lee and Darrin of the jury's decision that a violation had occurred.

STATEMENT OF VIOLATION

The jury reached consensus that Darrin plagiarized in numerous instances throughout his thesis. He often quoted passages verbatim without quotation marks and sometimes failed to cite the author. The extent to which plagiarism occurred shows that Darrin understood neither the principles nor the procedures of citation. Although the jury did not feel that Darrin acted with malicious intent, it is nevertheless the responsibility of every student to cite
sources properly. In failing this responsibility, Darrin violated the academic honor code. This violation is particularly graven given that Darrin had ample opportunity in his four years at Haverford to learn the importance of proper citation.

CIRCUMSTANTIAL

After everyone had shared a moment of silence, the jury explained its decision to Darrin and Professor Lee. Members of the jury then began to ask questions about the circumstances of Darrin's plagiarism.

Replying to these questions, Darrin said that he had not been rushed when writing the plagiarized portions of his thesis. He knew that he was typing verbatim from his sources, but he referred in his text to the authors; he thought that by replacing a few words he was paraphrasing, but now he realized that his technique had been a "futile attempt" at correct citation. One juror asked, "if you acknowledge ideas and exact words in the same way, how does the reader know which you are doing, what words are yours?" Darrin repeated that he saw this distinction now, but that since no one had questioned his method of citation, his "carelessness had fostered itself." He said that as a member of the Haverford community he had challenged himself on many social issues, and wished he had done the same in his academic endeavors.

One jury member asked Darrin how he felt about all his past work, and he replied that he had already asked the professor of another course to re-examine the papers he had written that semester. Professor Lee said that she "could not see any logic" in Darrin's statements. Further, she could not believe that a senior did not know the "basic rules of using quotation marks." Darrin agreed that it seemed irrational.

After another moment of silence, Darrin apologized for plagiarizing. Following further discussion, the chair asked Darrin and Professor Lee for their suggested resolutions.

Darrin said that he should (1) talk with a member of his department to learn about proper footnoting, and (2) write a letter to the community.

Professor Lee recommended on behalf of her department that Darrin (1) fail his thesis, (2) write a new one on a different topic, and (3) write a letter to the community. These suggested resolutions put both Darrin's graduation (less than a week away) and his long-range plans in great jeopardy, and he became extremely upset. Professor Lee felt the weight of Darrin's distress and was moved to tears. The meeting came to a close; Darrin, his support person and Professor Lee left the room.
JURY DISCUSSION OF RESOLUTIONS

Jurors could not help being distressed that Darrin had been writing all his papers at Haverford using faulty citation. However, they focused the discussion on resolutions dealing with (1) the thesis itself, (2) a letter to the community, and (3) the upcoming commencement ceremony.

A juror suggested that Darrin fail his thesis, correct its footnoting mistakes, and then write a second thesis. Although only a professor can mandate a grade change, the jury felt it was important to make a responsible recommendation on this matter. But the question of whether Darrin should fail his thesis was a difficult one for the jury. To several jurors an "F" seemed purely punitive, especially considering Darrin's "lack of deceitful intent." One juror suggested that Darrin instead be given simply "no credit," or that the research portions of his thesis be graded separately from the more creative portions. But other jurors felt strongly that a thesis is written and read as a whole. Even one instance of plagiarism would destroy its integrity as a respectable document. After much discussion, the jury agreed that Darrin's plagiarism was offensive to his professors, the Haverford community, and the larger academic community. However, jurors viewed the gravity of the offense with varying degrees of severity. Unable to commit firmly to a resolution, the jury turned to other questions.

The jury believed that a letter to students taking courses in Darrin's major, rather than a letter to the whole community, would be more specific and helpful to the students. The jury felt that this abstract would fulfill Darrin and Honor Council's responsibility to the Haverford community.

The jury also wholeheartedly agreed that Darrin should be permitted to march at graduation that weekend.

The issue of grade change yet unresolved, the jury felt it could not allow time pressures or fatigue to preempt a conscientious decision. The jury decided to meet the next morning.

After a moment of silence, one juror said that she had been struggling with the prospect of Darrin failing. She felt the jury was ignoring the time Darrin had devoted to his thesis as well as the personal anguish he was experiencing now. The resolution, she said, should address not only the issue of plagiarism but also issues of Darrin's specific needs. Another juror responded that, while the Honor Code does encourage a jury to tailor its resolutions to individual situations, the jury should not forget the seriousness of plagiarism. Thus, the jury agreed that Darrin's thesis should be failed and that the mitigating circumstances should be addressed in other, non-academic sections of the resolution.
The discussion became very difficult and tense, and the chairperson suggested, "It seems...that the action we're taking is so serious that we need to be sure we know we each support it strongly." Each juror then offered his/her view of the violation and the working resolutions. Several jurors mentioned the positive, educational aspects of correcting the old thesis and of having the privilege of writing a new one. One juror reminded everyone that all students, once they graduate, represent Haverford. Another jury member said that any occurrence of plagiarism in a paper is cause for failure. In this case there were many instances of plagiarism and the paper carried even greater weight because it was a thesis. The jury finally reached consensus on the three-part tentative resolution. Two jurors volunteered to inform Professor Lee and Darrin.

PRESENTATION OF RESOLUTIONS

(please read over the "Final Resolutions" below so that this section of the abstract will make some sense.)

The jury met again the next day and reached consensus on the resolution. Then Professor Lee, Darrin, and his support person joined the jury.

Members of the jury discussed their reasoning for each part of the resolution, describing the letter to the department as an "outgrowth" of Darrin's suggestion for a letter to the community and reaffirming the recommendation concerning commencement as a "gesture of our support and our readiness to avoid unnecessary pain." Jurors spent the most time explaining the recommendation that Darrin fail his thesis. The jury reiterated its concern about plagiarism and its belief that, as a writer, Darrin must take responsibility for how he represents himself to his readers.

The chairperson then asked for Darrin's and Professor Lee's responses. Darrin asked that Professor Lee answer first; she said that she and the department accepted the jury's resolutions.

Darrin spoke next. He was very angry, and he described the difficulties he and his family faced throughout the trial process; he felt he had suffered enough punishment already. He insisted that he had been "poorly advised" and that Haverford, by assuming that seniors fully understand citation, neglects its obligation to educate each student. He felt that, despite his respect for his deans and the jury, the problem of his plagiarism had been handled unfairly.

This disturbed a juror who asked Darrin to suggest specific changes in the resolutions rather than "hollering." Darrin said he was willing to write another thesis, but he did not want to correct the old thesis and felt that he should receive a lowered grade on it rather than a failing one.
Some jurors also tried to respond to Darrin's plans to attend graduate school in the fall. The jury decided that Darrin's concern about graduate school and that sympathy for Darrin's distress should not affect their resolution.

Darrin's other personal concerns could be best addressed through other resources, such as the deans and counseling service. It would be unfair to other confronted parties if the jury were to treat Darrin more leniently because he had made an emotional appeal to them.

Although Darrin conceded to having plagiarized, he nevertheless asserted that Professor Lee had wronged him by not noticing earlier. But one juror pointed out, "You're asking the professor to distrust you." Another juror added that she saw a professor's role in upper-level courses as being less concerned with the mechanics of footnoting. Other jury members expressed strongly that Darrin should not insult his professor or the department by blaming them for his own errors.

The jury and Darrin tried to discuss the specifics of the first resolution. Darrin said that since the thesis was going to be failed anyway, he should not have to correct it. Jurors suggested that making the corrections might be "cathartic" or would at least demonstrate to Darrin the magnitude of his plagiarism. Darrin disagreed. He said that returning to the old thesis now would be too painful to be a productive experience.

In regard to the grade change, Darrin said that the average of an "F" and whatever grade he made on his second thesis would be too low, but jurors pointed out that the department was extending a generous offer to sponsor a whole new thesis. Darrin then agreed to fail his thesis if he did not have to revise it.

Finally, Darrin and Professor Lee explained to the jury the difference between "full" and "social" commencement, and Darrin asked that the word full be added to clarify the third resolution.

After Professor Lee, Darrin, and his support person had left the room, the jury spent more time discussing the resolutions. The third resolution was revised according to Darrin's suggestion, and the jury came to consensus on the following final resolutions.

FINAL RESOLUTIONS

1. The jury suggests that Darrin receive a failing grade on his thesis. Because his work does not meet standards of academic integrity, the jury suggests that he revise the plagiarized portions of his thesis so that they accord with the proper methods of citation. Furthermore, we believe that the thesis constitutes an important part of Darrin's work at Haverford, and so we suggest that he be given an opportunity to write a second thesis on another topic. His
final grade would be an average of the first and second thesis.

2. Darrin should write a letter for his department detailing the principles and procedures of proper citation. Recognizing the emphasis that the department already places on educating students in this process, we hope that this letter will provide an additional means of expressing the gravity of plagiarism.

3. Although it is inconsistent with college policy, we recommend that Darrin be allowed to participate in full commencement ceremonies with his class but accept a blank diploma. He will receive his actual diploma upon successful completion of the above resolutions.

ADDENDUM

After every trial the chairperson gives the dean of the college a "Dean's Report," detailing the discussions of the entire trial. In Darrin's case, the dean (after consulting other members of the administration and faculty) approved the sentiment of the jury's resolutions but suggested several changes. The dean discussed these changes with several members of the jury and with Darrin and then submitted them, along with the Dean's Report and the jury's original resolutions, to the president of the college. The following are the dean's changes and his explanations for them.

1. Darrin's transcript should show that he took the thesis course twice; he would have two separate grades, the first one being an "F". The dean felt that "since the new thesis represents new work, the failing grade of the old thesis should not be figured into the evaluation of the new thesis." The dean also clarified many details about the writing and advising of the second thesis, and exempted Darrin from paying tuition for this extra course.

2. The dean combined Darrin's revision of his thesis and his writing of a letter to the department into single resolution: that Darrin would not revise the thesis but would, in his letter to the department, use three substantial excerpts from his old thesis to illustrate principles and procedures of citation.

3. Finally, the dean spoke with Darrin about "full" versus "social" commencement. Darrin felt that social commencement, in which he would march with the class but would not be called to the stage, would be a form of punishment. The dean explained that social commencement is usually used for students who have for some reason been unable to finish their work; it "reflects the college's
belief that the student fully understands academic standards. Since the [other resolutions] reflect the opinion that Darrin has not yet come to terms with those standards, the granting of this privilege can not come easily." Social commencement would be permitted only out of compassion for Darrin, the dean said; but Darrin remained expressly opposed to the idea of social commencement. The dean decided that "it would make no sense to either Darrin or the college.... Darrin should complete his work in a timely fashion, come to full terms with academic standards, and process with full confidence in himself and pride in his work in [next year's] commencement ceremonies."