Summary: Adam confronted Yvette for suspected academic dishonesty on a homework paper for their class with Professor Shore. A trial was held, and the jury determined that Yvette's failure to follow the professor's policy or to footnote constituted a breach of the Honor Code. The jury came to a three-part resolution.

After confronting Yvette, Adam brought his concerns to a member of Honor Council. At the next Council meeting, the chairperson presented Adam's and Yvette's situation (without using any names) to the rest of Council to discuss the possibility of a trial; members of Council said they would be more comfortable calling the trial once the chairperson had contacted Professor Shore, who knew about Adam's concern. The chairperson met with the professor the next day, and that evening Council met again briefly, reaching consensus that because there was a question concerning Yvette's academic integrity, a trial was necessary. The chairperson then notified Adam and Yvette that a trial would occur. After outlining the trial procedure, the chairperson told Adam and Yvette that they had the right to each bring a support person. The trial, involving a jury of 8 Council members and 4 other community members (chosen from the month's random jury list) as well as Adam and Yvette, began the next day.

FACT FINDING

The trial commenced with a moment of silence. The chairperson then went around the table, asking each juror to question his or her ability to be objective and fair. The chairperson also asked Yvette and Adam whether they felt comfortable with the selected jury. No one voiced any discomfort, and the chair went on to elucidate the trial process. After responding to questions, the chair invited Yvette and Adam to speak.

Adam said that he had handed in the homework in question for Professor Shore's class on a Wednesday and had gotten it back on Friday in class. The homework consisted of five problems, three assigned to all students and two that the students needed to find themselves. On Wednesday, before collecting the homework, the professor went over the three assigned questions and Adam took notes on these, acknowledging and highlighting in yellow his new work. On Friday, the professor handed back the problem sets and went over problems that he felt particularly troubling to students. Adam said that Yvette had not been in class on Wednesday, but had been there on Friday. On Sunday night, Yvette came to Adam's room and asked him if she could borrow his last two assignments. Adam said he felt uncomfortable giving her his work and so asked her if she had already completed and handed hers in. Yes, she told him, she had turned it in on Saturday. Still feeling misgivings, Adam gave her the assignment, but asked one of his friends to go into her room to see what she was doing. The friend told Adam that when he had looked in her room, Yvette had been sitting on her bed with her books open and Adam's assignment before her. She had "jumped out of the bed and looked nervous".

Adam said that he went to see Professor Shore before class on Monday. Without revealing his suspicion, he tried to verify when Yvette had handed in her homework. As they walked into the office, they saw the assignment on the floor. Professor Shore said she'd been in and out of her office all morning and therefore could not have missed it. Adam left, concluding that Yvette had only very recently handed in her assignment.

Adam said that he then spoke with Yvette. She said that she had turned in the assignment on Friday or Saturday. He felt suspicious of her story because that Monday morning, before he had talked with Professor Shore, he had seen Yvette walking away from Professor Shore's office building. When he asked her about this, she replied that she hadn't left her dorm until lunchtime. Because of the discrepancies between Yvette's story and his own observations, Adam felt confirmed in his suspicions. At this point, he spoke with a member of Honor Council. Adam showed the jury a copy of his and a copy of Yvette's homework. He pointed out similarities in methods and mistakes.

Yvette spoke after Adam. She said she had been late to class that Monday and did not find out about the homework set due Wednesday until late Tuesday night. She did not attend class that Wednesday, when
Professor Shore and gone over the three assigned problems. In Friday's class the homework was returned, and Professor Shore went over some of the more difficult problems from the assignment. After class later that day, Yvette talked with students about how to do all five of the problems. She had asked Adam to suggest which problems she should do for her two self-selected ones, and he suggested several. She said that she completed the homework and handed it in on Friday or Saturday. On Sunday night she asked Adam if she could see his homework, which she took back to her room.

At this point, the jury started asking questions of Yvette and Adam. When asked why she had not cited any of the help she received from her classmates, Yvette said that because the class was small, she assumed Professor Shore would remember that she had been there on Friday, when some of the problems had been reviewed. Members of the jury asked Yvette if she'd known that she was not allowed to ask others about specific problems or that she should have cited any help that she did receive. At first it had been unclear as to whether Yvette had understood Professor Shore's policy, but she later admitted that she had.

Another juror asked Yvette why she had borrowed homework set. She responded, "I don't even know why I picked up his homework."

Jurors wanted to know if Yvette had spoken with the professor about Adam's confrontation. She said that after she had been contacted by Honor Council she had confided in a friend, who recommended she see Professor Shore. Yvette tried once, but missed her; after that, she "didn't think about it again."

After all the jury felt that it had asked enough questions to determine whether a violation had occurred, they decided to break, but they first asked Yvette and Adam if either of them had any further comments or questions. Yvette then said that she did not really know why she was at a trial. She felt that she, Adam, and Professor Shore could have settled the problem among themselves. Also, when she had arrived at the trial, she had been surprised to walk into a room with so many people (the 12 jurors). In response, the jury explained that the Honor Code states that all cases of suspected academic dishonesty warrant a trial. After re-outlining the trial process, the chairperson reminded Yvette that she had already done so in 2 previous conversations and a formal letter, which Yvette had neglected to read. Both Adam and Yvette then left.

**JURY DISCUSSION**

The jury set out to answer a yes-no question: whether or not a violation had occurred. Jury members were troubled that Yvette seemed to know so little about what had occurred and that several of her responses contradicted each other. They tried to organize their discussion into two parts: (1) whether Yvette had broken Professor Shore's policy and (2) whether she had lied about when she had handed in her work.

In discussing Professor Shore's policy and Yvette's actions, the jury keyed in on two issues--that Yvette had talked with students about specific problems, and that she had not acknowledged this on her homework problems before turning them in. The jury felt Yvette had clearly violated this policy. Also, the jury recognized that failure to footnote any outside source, although not expressly stated in the professor's policy, constitutes plagiarism and a violation of the Honor Code.

At first it had been unclear whether Yvette understood Professor Shore's policy or not. As for the question of citing help, the jury didn't think Yvette had been aware of her violation.

The jury then discussed whether Yvette had been treated fairly with regard to the trial. Members were concerned because Adam had not suggested that she contact an Honor Council member within the week after he confronted her, which seemed to put her on the spot unfairly.

The most difficult issue for the jury was the question of Yvette's lying. It seemed unlikely to people that Professor Shore would miss an assignment lying on his floor all morning. Many jurors were curious about Yvette's borrowing an assignment she had supposedly already completed, but they couldn't be sure
she had copied. After much discussion, the jury decided it could not determine whether Yvette had lied, but that its misgivings were serious enough to be included in the later statement of the violation.

Two members agreed to call Adam and Yvette and let them know of the jury's decision that a violation had occurred. The jury then broke for the day.

CIRCUMSTANTIAL

The jury reconvened and spent a few minutes discussing with Yvette and Adam its determination of a violation.

The chairperson then invited jurors to ask more questions, reminding everyone that the goal was to understand the circumstances well enough to create a resolution that would both educate Yvette and bridge the breach of trust with the community. First, a juror asked "Did you know that you were not supposed to ask for specific help on the problems before turning them in?" Yvette responded yes. She also repeated that she knew she should have acknowledged the help she had received on the homework, but hadn't, because she thought Professor Shore had seen her in class Friday, thus knowing she had seen how to do some of the problems.

Other jurors wanted to know why Yvette had handed in the assignment at all. She said, "I really hoped to get some credit." When asked if she thought she would deserve it, she said no, but that Professor Shore was relaxed about giving credit. Questioning Yvette's intentions made some jurors uncomfortable. One juror pointed out that people don't always act with full consideration of their intentions.

Another juror asked Adam whether he felt that the discrepancies between Yvette's and his story could be satisfactorily counted for. He said no.

Yvette and Adam were asked for possible resolutions, but neither offered any. They then left, and the jury began to discuss its suggestions for resolutions.

JURY DISCUSSION

The jury began by determining the exact violation committed (see below), again returning to the question of whether Yvette had lied. Several jurors had changed their minds during the last meeting with Yvette. Although all jurors felt uncomfortable with her account of the story, they had different degrees of suspicion.

The jury discussed the gravity of the accusation of lying. Some said that calling Yvette a liar would be destructive instead of constructive; without such a judgment, the resolution would be more helpful and educational, while still addressing the needs of the community. But another member of the jury objected, saying that he was afraid "we're wimping out" and that "if we thought she was lying, we should say so." This sparked discussion. One juror said he believed Yvette had lied but that intention played an important role in lying, and he couldn't be sure whether Yvette was trying to cheat or was just confused. The jury eventually agreed that the degrees of their discomfort did not warrant an accusation so serious as lying.

The jury reached consensus on the following violation:

The jury determined that Yvette's actions constituted a violation of the Honor Code.

Seeking help from other students on specific problems before turning in an assignment goes against Professor Shore's policy. Although Yvette was aware of this policy, she felt it did not apply in this instance because the answers to the problems had already been explained in class. However, she did in fact violate the professor's policy by turning in her homework after receiving help from her friends. Further, Yvette neglected to provide written acknowledgement for the help she received on the homework. These two violations constitute a breach of the academic Honor Code.

Many of the jury members suspected that Yvette had handed in her assignment Monday morning as Adam had indicated. Several members also thought she had used Adam's homework to complete her own. However, due to their differing opinions, the jury could not reach consensus that Yvette had actually lied to Adam and the jury in her account of her actions.
The jury then began to work on resolutions to address Yvette's breach of Professor Shore's policy and of the Honor Code. The issue that took the most time was that of a grade change. Although grade changes are ultimately up to the professor, the jury wanted to include a responsible and fair recommendation in the resolution. Someone suggested Yvette's failing the homework portion of her grade. Although almost everyone agreed this would be fair, one juror was afraid that such a change would be purely punitive. In response, a juror said "When a rule is broken, it puts that rule in jeopardy for the rest of the community." But when the rule is broken, and a penalty is attached, "it helps to reestablish it for the rest of the community." Another juror member talked about the importance of accepting responsibility for past actions. Indeed, she said, Yvette needs to be accountable for what she did.

In order to help promote future participation in the class, the jury felt it should try to ensure that Yvette would continue to do the homework, even though she would not receive credit for it. Therefore the jury suggested that Yvette should fail the class if she does not complete her homework. The jury then reached consensus on the following resolution, and again two jurors volunteered to let Adam and Yvette know.

PRESENTATION OF RESOLUTION

The jury met with Adam and Yvette again, discussed the tentative resolution, and asked for Adam's and Yvette's responses. Adam said he was satisfied with the resolution. Yvette stated that she thought the suggested grade change was too severe, and voiced confusion about the trial process. She didn't understand why such a "small incident" had gone to trial in the first place. Concerned, the jury tried to respond to Yvette by elaborating further on the discussion that led to the resolution. After reiterating the trial process, the chairperson reminded Yvette that she could appeal the resolution to the President of the College within five days. The jury, Yvette and Adam then talked about the community of the classroom and respect for the professor and for other students.

After Yvette and Adam left the room, the jury reached consensus on the resolution. The tentative resolution then became final.

FINALE RESOLUTION

Yvette is to meet with Professor Shore to discuss her policy for student collaboration and acknowledgement of help from others. She should then use this discussion to formulate a written statement that Professor Shore may use for future classes.

At least twice a month for the duration of the semester, Yvette will talk to a juror with whom she feels comfortable. In these meetings, Yvette and the juror will discuss the nature of an individual's responsibility to the community under the Honor Code, including issues of academic integrity regardless of academic credit. Together, the two will write an anonymous letter to the community detailing the trial process.

The jury suggests that Yvette fail the homework portion of her grade. However, the jury also feels that continuing with this work and communicating with Professor Shore will help her gain a greater understanding of working honestly and responsibly. Thus, the jury recommends that Yvette still be required to turn in the remaining assignments in order to pass the course. One jury member stood outside consensus with regard to this portion of the resolution.

Note: In the April 28 issue of the Bryn Mawr - Haverford News Adam wrote a letter to the community describing his experience as the confronting party.